Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

APRIL, 1919

THE INDEPENDENCE OF AMERICA*

MUST IT BE SACRIFICED TO HUMANITY?

BY THE EDITOR

WHEN Abraham Lincoln arrived in Washington from Springfield, in 1861, the nation was confronting the most vital crisis that had arisen in its history. With deep and solemn appreciation of that dreadful fact Mr. Lincoln uttered these words in his first inaugural:

"My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If there be an object to hurry any of you in hot haste to a step which you would never take deliberately, that object will be frustrated by taking time, but no good object can be frustrated by it."

That was the counsel of tolerance, of prudence and of wisdom. Our country is now facing another paramount exigency. Opinions may differ as to its importance compared with that which arose in 1861. I feel myself—and I am trying to speak without exaggeration but from a sense of profound conviction—that it is even more vital. What would have happened if our Union had been divided into two separate commonwealths no man can predicate

---

* An address to the Bankers' Association of Chicago.

Copyright, 1919, by North American Review Corporation. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with any semblance of authority. By the mercy of God, the necessity of engaging in such speculation did not arise. We are, however, assured of this fact that, even though disunion had eventuated, the fundamental principles and traditions of the Republic would have been retained by each of the two nations thus created. How long to their mutual disadvantage they would have remained separate entities no one can tell, nor for the present purpose is it essential or profitable to attempt to formulate an opinion.

The point I wish to emphasize by way of contrast is that the danger which now confronts America is vastly greater than even that of those black days immediately preceding the Civil War, for the reason that we are now asked to change our form of government, to divest our nation of its full independence and its most cherished tradition, and to sacrifice in part at least our sovereignty. That is what the proposed mingling of the United States with the Powers of Europe and of Asia means. The fact is undeniable; indeed it is admitted reluctantly but definitely by the proponents of the new order of the government of the world.

If it were necessary to produce evidences in substantiation of this statement there would be no difficulty in doing so. Both the President and the ex-President, the leaders of the movement, have made the acknowledgment over and over again. They insist merely that such a waiver is one only of degree; that it is in no essential sense a novelty because every treaty ever made bears a concession, however slight, of like import. This rejoinder is neither conclusive nor convincing, for the reason that every treaty entered into by the United States contains a distinct provision that it may be legally abrogated or denounced at any time upon compliance with certain prescribed conditions. That is to say, a treaty is temporary in its nature and not binding upon the contracting parties beyond the time when either may deem its continuance in force disadvantageous or unadvisable.

The present proposal, on the other hand, is perpetual, a covenant from which none of the parties thereto can withdraw with honor or without in effect declaring war upon the rest of the world. Upon this point also there is no disagreement. Even though there were a difference of opinion as to the inherent right of withdrawal, regardless

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the absence from the written document of such a privilege, the very existence of the doubt might easily produce confusion, misunderstandings and disasters surpassing even those likely to spring from the implied denial of the right itself.

I shall not attempt to analyze the concrete proposal submitted to the country by the President. That has already been done so thoroughly and so effectively that nothing that I could say would add materially to the store of knowledge which you already possess. There is moreover another wholly practical reason. It is now clearly evident that the covenant in its present form is doomed to failure. We may safely assume that the pledge signed by more than one-third of the Senators and supported by an actual majority makes this a certainty, wholly aside from recent information from Paris that several of the other Powers regarded the published draft as purely tentative, have had at no time any real intention of accepting it unamended, and acquiesced in its promulgation for the sole purpose of serving the President's convenience.

Even the President himself, while not modifying his insistence that no material change whatever would be admissible, inferentially conceded upon the eve of sailing, the necessity of adopting another method, at least, of achieving his ultimate aim. Tacitly recognizing the impossibility of imposing his will upon the coördinate branch of the treaty-making power, he announced his purpose to circumvent the Senate by so weaving into the treaty of peace the threads of the covenant that separation would be impossible, and that thereby he would put the Senate in such a position that it would be compelled to ratify his proposals or to assume responsibility for continuance of the war, thus following the course of Congress when it puts a "rider," wholly extraneous in nature, upon an appropriation bill, which the Executive must approve perforce, to provide means for conducting the affairs of the Government.

The ethics, or even perhaps the morality, of such a proceeding I shall not discuss. To do so would involve almost necessarily consideration of, and perhaps reflection upon, the President's motives. Into that realm I shall not and you would not wish me to enter. Nevertheless, while I would not under any circumstances, in the common phrase, attack the President, I hold it to be not only the right but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the positive obligation, especially of a publicist, not only to criticise but to denounce anything and everything that a President may do or attempt to do that seems to be wrong. We are altogether too prone to make a fetich of our Chief Magistrate and to regard his every act as of origin so nearly approaching divine as to be practically immune even to discussion. After all, every President, from Washington to Wilson, has been the same fallible being after he entered the White House as he was before; and, after all, he continues to be in fact, as one occasionally disingenuously declares himself to be in theory, a mere public servant, whose official performances are properly subject to the approval or disapproval of his masters.

But, however we may regard the propriety under our laws and customs of the procedure which the President announces he shall follow in the accomplishment of his purpose, none can deny the merit or the value of his frankness. Forewarned is forearmed. For the first time since he sailed away to France early in December and substituted intensive secrecy for the "open covenants openly arrived at" which had been guaranteed by the first of the fourteen commandments, we now know precisely what to expect. Nor is there occasion for surprise in the programme adopted. Long ago, before Mr. Wilson had any anticipation of becoming President of the United States, he formulated his theory of the practical relationship of the two treaty-making branches of the Government. Writing in 1907 on Constitutional Government in the United States, Dr. Wilson said:

"Of one of the greatest of the President's powers I have not yet spoken at all: his control, which is very absolute, of the foreign relations of the nation. The initiative in foreign affairs, which the President possesses without any restriction whatever is virtually the power to control them absolutely. The President cannot conclude a treaty with a foreign Power without the consent of the Senate, but he may guide every step of diplomacy, and to guide diplomacy is to determine what treaties must be made, if the faith and prestige of the government are to be maintained. *He need disclose no step of negotiation until it is complete, and when in any critical matter it is completed the Government is virtually committed.* Whatever its disinclination the Senate may feel itself committed also."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It will be seen, therefore, that the course which the President has avowedly marked out for himself conforms precisely to the theory then enunciated. Other Presidents have held other views. President Lincoln, for example, addressing the Senate under date of June 23, 1862, on the project of a treaty between the United States and Mexico, which had been proposed to him by our minister to Mexico, said:

"The action of the Senate is of course conclusive against the acceptance of the treaties on my part. I have, nevertheless, thought it just to our excellent minister in Mexico and respectful to the Government of that Republic to lay the treaties before the Senate together with the correspondence which has occurred in relation to them. In performing this duty I have only to add that the importance of the subject thus submitted to the Senate cannot be overestimated, and I shall cheerfully receive and consider with the highest respect any further advices the Senate may think proper to give upon the subject."

A more striking illustration of the antithesis in judgment of President Lincoln and President Wilson with respect to the prerogatives of the Senate could not be desired. It is, moreover, a reasonable assumption that, if Mr. Wilson had treated the coördinate branch with the respect and consideration accorded by Mr. Lincoln, much of the confusion and acrimony which has risen, greatly to the disadvantage of our country before the eyes of the world, might have been averted.

Instead, however, as we all know, following his own lead, which differs sharply from that not only of President Lincoln, but of every predecessor beginning with Washington, he ignored the Senate completely, denied it any participation in the negotiations and designated as his associates personal retainers of slight, though respectable, repute.

There was, moreover, a particular reason why one so solemnly and so frequently pledged to heed the voice of the people might well have taken a broader view. Only a month before he had submitted somewhat defiantly his policies to the country, and the country, rightly or wrongfully, had rejected those policies by a majority exceeding 1,300,000, and had substituted the Republican Party for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Democratic Party in control of the Senate itself. Despite, however, this clear indication of the attitude of the people and of his own pledge to accept their judgment without cavil, he disregarded the verdict and pursued his course, even to the point of disregarding an age-long tradition by forsaking his post of duty and assuming personal control of the negotiations in foreign lands.

The pity of this is now only too apparent in the prolongation of the conference called primarily to determine the terms of peace, until now at the end of three months, practically nothing has been accomplished, to the great distress and danger of all of the peoples of Europe and to the continuing discomfort and anxiety of our own countrymen, the reconstruction of whose industrial affairs is so sadly needed. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to exculpate President Wilson from responsibility for this most distressing condition. Both at home and abroad the probability is now recognized that but for the President's insistence upon the injection at the outset of his favorite project, peace would have been attained in January and the whole world would have been released from its fetters, to begin at least the mighty tasks essential to renewal of the ordinary activities of existence which alone can make for the restoration of human happiness.

But, except for the lessons which may be derived, the mistakes of the past, if they be mistakes, may be ignored. Our concern is with the present and the immediate future. Even though, as we have assumed, the tentative programme cannot win essential acceptance, the substance of the plan has not been and will not be abandoned. The President is so fully committed to the project and so firmly convinced of the support of the people that a test of the sentiment of the country is inevitable. Whether he will succeed in convincing the delegates of the other Powers of his ability to so entwine the League notion with the peace treaty proper as to enable him to coerce the Senate seems doubtful; but, failing that, there is hardly a question of his fetching home some kind of proposition upon which to raise a definite issue before the country. Let us, then, go to the root of the matter.

In the first place, no League to Enforce Peace can be devised which is not in effect a League to Enforce War—war to be waged by its members upon any country which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

refuses to submit to their decrees. The President, unconsciously perhaps, admitted that when, at Great Britain's insistence, he withdrew his demand for freedom of the seas because, forsooth, upon reflection he perceived that there could be no neutrals with a League in operation. Precisely why, he did not say, but in any case he regarded it as a joke on himself that he had never thought of that before. Incidentally the support of Great Britain was essential to the success of his project and Great Britain would not budge from her great tradition of sea control. Hence the unsuspected jest.

Secondly, no conceivable advantage shall accrue to the United States. Upon that point the President was rigidly insistent from the start and finally, through the exercise of his remarkable persuasive talents, he won the acquiescence of the other Powers. Indeed, if the truth must be told, from the very beginning their one concern has been, not whether they could get something out of us, but how much. Great Britain, of course, will yield nothing. She is in the position of the rich man whose sole need is to find somebody to guarantee his perpetual possession of what he already has. We are to be that somebody—maybe. France and Italy will readily cancel manufactured claims to territories which they have no use for and never really wanted. In return for these extraordinary concessions we are to give them control of the United States. Not immediately, of course; that might seem too obvious. We are only to finance them for a while and send our soldiers to police their outlying provinces. You may think that an exaggeration. It is not. That is precisely what the President has agreed to once and will agree to, in substance, again if he can find some way to turn the corner of the Capitol.

A perfect parallel is this: You have built up a great, successful bank. Some other like institutions not so very near are attacked successfully by burglars. You go to their assistance, not in a dream or because you have visions of an approaching millennium, but because you fear that if those burglars are not stopped they may rob you, too. You arrive in the nick of time to help the others beat off the burglars.

When it is all over you find that you have incurred heavy liabilities, but that your capital and surplus are still intact, your deposits show signs of increasing and your

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bank is the soundest, richest and most promising in the land. Meanwhile, those other banks have suffered sadly. Two or three are on the verge of bankruptcy. You meet to consider the situation. You have done your full part but you are willing to do more. You will extend loans, you will make fresh loans, you will reduce interest, you will do anything in reason that can be asked. Then somebody makes a proposal. It is that all the banks combine and pool assets and liabilities, the assets being yours, of course, and the liabilities theirs, and there will be nine directors of whom you shall be one and President. They are to have the control, but you are to have the honor. Think of that!

And who do you suppose makes this remarkable proposition? Why, you, the head of the great solvent bank, and the others hem and haw about it for a while and after persuading you to concede this, that and the other to bind the bargain, finally consent. Then you go back to your stockholders and report what you have done in the name of humanity, for the common good, and demand ratification of your superb performance. Suppose all that should happen! Where do you think you would get off? Well, that is the precise proposition which now confronts the stockholders of the United States. It is a homely illustration, but a true one. I defy anybody to find a flaw in the analogy.

The similarity, in fact, in a broad sense, stretches further than I have indicated. Whatever in the case imagined might be the attitude of your stockholders and whatever, when the time comes, may be the attitude of the stockholders of the United States, there can be no question whatever of the eagerness with which the insolvent banks in the one instance or the impoverished Powers in the other would welcome the proposal. Surprise has been manifested at the readiness of England to join the combination, and many compliments have been paid to the President for his success in "converting" Lloyd George. But why should not England gladly and thankfully enter into such an arrangement? In the first place, it is her own scheme from top to bottom. There is a common supposition that it is an American plan conceived by an American President. That is not the fact. America is only a cat's paw in the business. The origin of every one of the thirteen famous Points

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remaining out of the fourteen uttered by the President on January 8 is absolutely and wholly British.

The only Commandment missing is the one abandoned by the President as a joke on himself at the behest of Great Britain. You will perceive, therefore, that instead of originating the bases of peace, as is generally supposed, the President merely adapted the propositions already avowed by the British Government. We are concerned for the moment in but one, namely, that creating a League of Nations, with respect to which the President replied to Senator Brandegee that four drafts of a proposed Constitution had been submitted, one each by the United States, Great Britain, France and Italy. The British plan, the President added in further response to Senator Brandegee's questioning, was the one adopted. The other plans had been "put aside." Nevertheless, if the Senator should insist, he thought it "possible" that the American plan might be produced for comparison. If it has been, the fact has not been made public. That is to say, the American people have not yet been permitted to see the plan prepared by their own Commission and probably never would have known that one had been submitted at all if Mr. Brandegee had not almost inadvertently elicited the information. Instead, we are not only asked but ordered to swallow a purely British concoction, hook, line and sinker.

Now I make no special point of that. If we must become a minority partner in world government instead of continuing to do business as an independent at the same old stand, and if the British scheme is the best suggested, well and good; but as the parties chiefly in interest, are not the American people fairly entitled at least to look at their own proposal and try to discern why another is preferable, especially when, as is universally admitted, they are doing all the giving and the others all the taking?

But perhaps we ought not to haggle about such things. Perhaps we ought to go it blind. That this is what we are expected to do there is no shadow of doubt. Senator McCormick spoke the exact truth when he said that "during his week's visit to the United States, President Wilson gave voice to two rhetorical rhapsodies, but he adduced no argument in support of any of the disputed articles and made no specific answer to any specific objection."

What he did say was that "the people are in the sad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dle," and that "statesmen must follow the clarified common thought or be broken," and that any Americans who failed to heed his admonition would be derelict in "their duty to mankind" if they did not assume whatever obligations might be put upon them by himself and his associates from other countries, "without counting the cost." And to this amazing assertion to a hundred millions of people who are not supposed to be devoid of common sense he added, "We"—meaning we Americans—"are ready to make the supreme sacrifice and throw in our fortunes with the fortunes of men everywhere."

Now that is going far. The Declaration of Independence contains no such pronouncement as that. It asserted merely that "these colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states," free to enjoy life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and as independent of the rest of the world as they freely conceded the rest of the world to be of them. And when the President took his oath of office he did not pledge himself to serve "men everywhere" throughout the world. He restricted himself, in the words of the Constitution, to a solemn promise that he would "faithfully execute the office of the President of the United States" and nothing more than that. "Men everywhere" did not elect him. "Men everywhere" do not pay him. His sole obligation is to this country.

But has anybody heard so much as a whisper from Paris of the slightest consideration of the future welfare of America? There is no concealment or denial of the obvious fact that the English delegates are concerned only with the British Empire; that the Frenchmen think only of France; and the Italians only of Italy. That is in no sense to their discredit. It is more than their privilege, more than their right, it is their duty. But if America has a single advocate among our commissioners to the great conference, no sign to that effect has appeared in the published reports. They represent humanity, even though they were not selected by humanity, and if the League of Nations shall be formed it is an irresistible conclusion that its first President will represent humanity, and that this great Republic will not have even one representative devoted exclusively to its interests out of the nine who will comprise the rulers of the world.

Now why are we asked to make this mighty sacrifice?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why has it suddenly become our duty to toss our cherished Republic into the melting pot to be crushed into a pulp of international socialism? To prevent a recurrence of war, we are told, and simultaneously we are warned by the President, that if his project is not realized, all Europe will soon be aflame and again weltering in a sea of blood. How can he know that? For fifty long years militant Prussia transparently threatened the peace of Europe. Today not only Prussia, but all Germany, all Austria, and all Turkey lie prostrate and helpless awaiting the stern judgment of those whom they so cruelly wronged.

Never in all its history has the prospect of enduring peace in Europe been so fair as it is today. The Allies are absolute masters of the situation. They can, and pray God, they may affix a penalty which will bar the outlaw from ever again threatening civilization. Do you not think they realize this? Do you doubt for a moment that they will do it? Already we read that, in the temporary absence of the American commission from Paris, they have decided to reduce the German army to a police force of one hundred thousand men and to keep it there. That is for the salvation of France. Do you suspect for a moment that England will permit the building of another German navy? Is it conceivable that those great and intelligent peoples who have suffered untold agonies, will agree to a settlement that will make it even remotely possible for either the autocracy or the people of Germany ever again to threaten their very existence?

Upon what conceivable ground can the President base his prediction, uttered with all of his accustomed assurance, of another immediate holocaust but for our or his interventions? May it not be possible that, shrewd and capable as he is, he may be as mistaken, as when he warned the American people that he could not hope to win the war for them unless immediately they granted the electoral franchise to women. You may accept it as a certainty, that our Allies neither seek nor desire assistance from us in dictating the terms of peace. All they want from us is the present use and the future control of our vast resources in money and, if need should arise, in men.

But we are informed, upon what authority I do not know, but certainly not of the Bible, that our first obligation is to those of distant climes rather than to our neighbors

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and ourselves. I deny that. I deny further that our primary duty is to "men everywhere." But even if it were, what reason is there to believe that by entering a combination, which as Senator Knox clearly demonstrated, is a breeder of wars and not a maker of peace, we could serve humanity better than we have served it since the fathers established this free Republic upon the sure foundation of liberty under law.

America has not failed in her duty to the world. From the moment that she signalled to oppressed beings throughout the world that here was safe refuge and equal opportunities for all, she has kept that beacon-light burning, and drawn within her borders millions who might otherwise have perished and who today are as proud of their citizenship and in the recent war have proved their fidelity equally with the descendants of the three millions who first constituted the nation.

By her example far more than by her precepts and far more than any other agency America has shattered the idols of monarchy and brought thrones crashing to the ground. Shall the continuing and ever increasing effects of that example be now dispensed with? Can better than the glorious results already attained be reasonably anticipated from a mingling of her undefiled spirit with the diverse and incongruous elements of the Old World?

All teaching, all tradition, all experience, points the contrary. We not only assume but demand virtual guardianship of the western hemisphere. Is not that enough? Is it not all that we can safely or ought to be asked to undertake? Would we not better still the ferment in Mexico and Peru and Chile and San Domingo and Costa Rica before attempting to foist everlasting peace upon the Balkans? And have we no vital problems within our own boundaries crying for solution? "To thine own self be true," applies with force no less as to a nation than to an individual.

To those who sneeringly remark to us of pigmy minds, "Produce something better than our League or forever after hold your peace," I reply: "That is not for us to do. It is for you to show wherein our country has failed and how it may hope more gloriously to fulfill its mission." Yours, not ours, is the burden of suggestion and proof. And we are free men. We will take no dictation and we will not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

follow blindly. Long have the American people safely pursued the course marked out for them by the Fathers of the Republic, and in the words of Abraham Lincoln only "the people themselves, and not their servants, can safely reverse their own deliberate decisions. . . . Whatever may be the wishes or dispositions of foreign States, the integrity of our country and the stability of our Government depend not upon them, but on the loyalty, the virtue, the patriotism and the intelligence of the American people. . . . Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess."

I can do no better than to leave you with those words of your martyred President ringing in your ears. I wish only to add, in conclusion, as from New England, of *our* great patriot that, while according unstinted admiration to those whose largeness of view enable them to say, with Garrison, "My country is the world, my countrymen are mankind," I am content to walk humbly, reverently, in the footsteps of Daniel Webster in the service of "my country, and nothing but my country," and I have only to regret that we cannot hear that great voice ring out as it did ring out of yore:

"Thank God, I—I also—am an American."

PRESUMPTUOUS PROPAGANDA

THE Hunnish propagandists are incorrigible. We had supposed that with exposure of their deviltries they would at least have the negative graces of shame and silence. So most detected malefactors do. But these are an exception to all rules. The more their falsehoods are exposed, the more they revel in them and rail and snarl at those who tell the truth. It is in vain that we address to them the demand that was made upon Falstaff: "What trick, what device, what starting-hole, canst thou now find to hide thee from this open and apparent shame?" The fat knight made a most ingenious excuse, for the cleverness of which we may forgive its falsity. But the Huns and their apologists disdain excuses, glory in their shame, and heap opprobrium upon those who expose them with the truth.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Conspicuously is this the case among those who we may term the intellectuals, in relation to that most insidious and most iniquitous of all forms of propaganda, the falsifying and corrupting of instruction. There was perhaps no more discreditable revelation made in all the drama of the war than that of the prostitution of literature, of pedagogy and of science to the vilest purposes of the would-be conquerors and ravishers. We now know that the German professors in American universities, who were sent hither under the exchange system were in fact chiefly unscrupulous agents of the Wilhelmstrasse, receiving large salaries from the German Foreign Office for their services as spies, intriguers and propagandists. We know that school and college text books, to say nothing of other literature, were deliberately falsified, in order to promote regard and admiration for Germany and to arouse unfounded prejudices against lands with which Germany was likely to clash. We know that a numerous company of the foremost scientists and educators of Germany early in the war signed their names to an elaborate public document which every one of them must have known to be a monstrous concoction of wanton lies.

Captain Ohlinger, of the United States, has recently reminded us most forcibly and indisputably of the German campaign which was carried on for years before the war in our public school system, with a view, as was frankly avowed by some, of Germanizing America. Thus in the State of Wisconsin, thirty years ago, it was found that 14 per cent of children of school age were not attending school at all, and that in 129 German Lutheran parochial schools no instruction whatever was given in the English language. Thereupon a law was made requiring all children from seven to fourteen years old to attend some school in which the "Three R's" and history were taught in English. Against this law the German population of the State arose in wrath, carried an election, and compelled its repeal. In Nebraska the German Alliance secured the enactment of a law compelling the teaching of a foreign language—which was certain to be German—in the primary schools whenever a certain number of parents demanded it.

So, too, German propaganda was surreptitiously introduced into text-books in our public schools. Works were used which taught that the United States was indebted to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany for a large share in its foundation and for the major part of its civilization and culture; that the spirit of the German people was far superior to that of Americans; that William II was a "Christian and hero" who "always followed the right path"; that Germany was a peace-loving nation surrounded by aggressive and militaristic foes; and that Germany though in name an empire was in fact a republic with a constitution much like that of the United States.

We should have thought, we repeat, that the simple exposure of these infamies would be sufficient to cover their authors with confusion and to silence them for criticism or even comment upon whatever reform and purification of our educational system might in consequence of these disclosures be effected. But it was not so. The contumacy of the propagandist, and of his knowing or unknowing assistant, is seemingly irrepressible and unconquerable. No effort is made, it is true, to defend or to palliate those Hunnish falsehoods and intrigues. But vigorous protests are made against the counteracting of that educational poison with application of wholesome truths.

Thus in Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard's *Nation* we find an impassioned diatribe, now sneering and sarcastic, now austere as a Hebrew prophet, against what it calls "Poisoning the Wells" and what it further describes as "subtly pernicious Government propaganda developed by the war" for the "prostitution of educational systems to the selfish purposes of rulers." It gives examples of this iniquity, culled from a manual of instruction concerning the war which has been adopted by officials of the New York Department of Education; thus: Responsibility for the war is placed, by this manual, "upon the shoulders of the German Emperor, his political and military leaders, and the German people;" such German authorities as Dr. Muelhon, Mr. Fernau, Prince Lichnowsky and Mr. Harden being authority for the charge. This is cited by the *Nation* as a hideous example of "systematic abuse, to say nothing of downright misrepresentation, of Germany and the German people" and "a view of the great war which is no less than a monstrous falsehood."

Again the manual is quoted as saying that "in Russia a revolt broke out against the pro-German court and the Czar * * * Kerensky tried to establish a stable government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but failed on account of the opposition of the extremists, Lenine and Trotzky. When these men attained power, they betrayed their country into the hands of Germany." Now that statement, in general and detail, according to the overwhelming weight of evidence, from both Russian and American sources, including that presented recently by the American Ambassador at Petrograd, is a notably precise and judicious statement of the truth. Yet the *Nation* seeks to pillory it as a monstrous falsehood intended for "searing the souls of little children with the blasting flame of hatred" and for "the poisoning of their spirit with falsehoods."

Another prescription which seems especially to infuriate the Hunnish propagandist or apologist is the syllabus of a conference of a department of the National Educational Association, which includes the following: How to teach pupils that democracy involves duties as well as rights; how to teach pupils respect for properly constituted authority; how to teach pupils to respect the rights of others; and how to teach pupils faithfulness in the discharge of responsibility. The average intelligent and thoughtful American will, we are sure, regard those four topics with sincere gratification, as indicating four eminently desirable courses of instruction. But the *Nation* dismisses it with the characteristic Villardian sneer: "A subservient citizenry, well drilled in falsehoods and hatreds, and trained to the duty of universal military service—what could be finer or more fitting fruit of a war fought for democracy?" We must assume, then, that the *Nation* would have the youth of America taught that democracy involves no duties, that no respect is to be given to constituted authority or to the rights of others, and that it is folly to be faithful in the discharge of responsibility.

After that we are not surprised to find the gentle Bolshevist rancidly ranting about "the incalculable injury that is being done to millions of innocent and impressionable children" and "sins against the Holy Spirit" for which "those who are to blame shall find no forgiveness though they seek with strong crying and tears." Of course we might say that even such carrion is innocuous, since in the very rankness of its reek it conveys its own antidote; but it would, as we know by only too painful experience, be unjudicious too confidently to depend upon such salvation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is nobody more inclined to such arguments than the offenders themselves. The thief is always an advocate of giving him all the rope he wants; and though he may ultimately hang himself, he contrives to do a vast deal of pilfering first.

When the definitive and deliberate history of these times comes to be written the philosophic historian will dwell with amazement, not unmixed with detestation on the one hand and reprobation on the other, upon the all but incredible impudicity of the Hunnish propaganda before, during and following the war, and upon the similarly all but incredible forbearance shown toward it by the American people.

THE SPOTS OF THE LEOPARD

THE proverbial saying about the paramount importance of the month of April in American history, for which there is indeed much basis in fact, may easily receive additional confirmation this year. Indeed, it can scarcely avoid it, unless some extraordinary influences cause the Peace Congress to content itself with marking time and listening to voices in the air for another four weeks. If, as we have every right to expect and to demand, at least the preliminary treaty of peace is agreed upon by the Allies and is dictated to Germany this month, another transcendent event will be added to the already unrivalled record of April; whether for good or for ill is yet in the lap of the gods.

For the settlement will have to do with both parties. We have said, and it cannot be said too emphatically, that the terms of the peace treaty should be determined by the Allies alone, and should be imparted to the Germans simply for their information and acceptance without demur or privilege of discussion. Any other course would, we believe, be a grave mistake, fraught with immeasurable potentiality of disaster. Nevertheless we must remember that the permanent value of the treaty will be not only in the reparatory and protective effect which it has or seems to have upon the Allies, but also, and perhaps equally, we shall not say in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

punitive but at least in the admonitory and chastening effect which it shall have upon the German people.

We emphasize this the more because it is quite obvious that the German spirit has not yet been brought to a realization of the grossness of Germany's offence against humanity and civilization, or even of Germany's defeat in the war.

The fear that this was the case arose at the very time of the making of the armistice, nearly five months ago, and it has never been dispelled nor even abated since that time, but on the contrary has been steadily and to a marked degree intensified and strengthened. It must be remembered that neither in communications with outside Powers nor in domestic deliberations has German guilt or German defeat been authoritatively admitted. The entire and consistent attitude of the German Goveriment, press and people has been that of a nation that was forced into war against its will by malignant enemies, that defended itself with valor and with success, and that finally brought the war to a close with at least as much honor on its side as on that of its opponents.

That Germany outlawed itself by atrocious violations of international law and the principles of humanity, and that it is now an object of general distrust and detestation, never enters the German mind. Nor is there the slightest thought of renouncing the savageries of "Kultur" for the human culture of the civilized world. What the German spirit was under the Hohenzollerns, that it is to-day, unchanged and defiant.

That, we say, is ominous; and one of the most essential things to be done—without which all else will be vain—in the treaty of peace is to bring Germany to a realization of the truth as the world knows it and sees it, and thus to at least the beginning and the possibility of a change for the better in the German attitude toward the world. We do not mean that the spirit of the German people should be broken and humiliated, much as they may deserve even such a fate. We do mean that for Germany to continue in her old spirit would be to perpetuate her menace to the peace of the world; that for her to get rid of that spirit and to get a better one in its place, what we may term political conversion is necessary; and, to continue the figure, to become converted it is necessary first to be convicted of sin.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Recall the course and the attitude of Germany in all respects since the armistice. The troops returning from the front were acclaimed as victors, as conquering heroes. There is scarcely an item in the armistice that has not been protested and denounced as not only ungenerous but also unjust, and the Allies have actually been warned not to presume too far upon German patience and forbearance.

Along the Rhine the Germans at first sought most unctuously to ingratiate themselves with the American troops, in order to sow dissension and distrust between them and the French; failing in which amiable design they turned against them viciously. With most flagrant propaganda and intrigues and even with open military operations Germany has been striving to thwart the recreation of the Polish state, and to assure the Germanization of the seceded Russian provinces along the Baltic and at the south. There have been appointed to the foremost places in the German Government those men who because of their crimes are most offensive to America and to the civilized world. The President long ago intimated that peace negotiations could be had only when Germany had at the head of affairs men whom we could trust and believe, and Germany replies by putting into her high places such creatures as Mathias Erzberger and Dr. Albert!

If the treaty which is expected to be made this month should confirm Germany in this spirit and attitude, or should permit her to remain in it, the prospect for the peace of the world would indeed be gloomy. Convinced that they were the foremost nation of the world, that though greatly maligned and wronged by the other Powers they were still unbeaten in the great war, and that they had a direct commission from their Old German Gott to conquer the world for "Kultur," they would never cease planning and preparing for another war until they had brought it about. No League of Nations, no treaty of peace—which they would of course regard as a scrap of paper—would avail to restrain them.

It is therefore supremely necessary that, whatever else it may or may not contain, the peace treaty shall contain something which will if possible bring home to the German mind the truth as others see it and incline the German

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people to abandon the Hunnish ambitions of the Hohenzollerns and to align themselves with the civilized world in pursuing the paths of peace. We do not wish them evil, but we wish the world well, and the welfare of the world requires that if possible the German spirit be exchanged for the spirit of humanity.

We, say, if possible. We hope that it is possible, and that hope is so strong as to warrant the most earnest and persistent effort to be made for its realization. Of course, if the thing is done at all, if it ever can be done, it must be done in the making of the treaty of peace. After that it would be impossible. And it may, anyway, be impossible for the leopard to change his spots. But one of the prime duties of the Peace Congress is to essay the task.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE OBSTRUCTION OF PEACE

BY DAVID JAYNE HILL

IT has become increasingly difficult to comment freely upon the conduct of the President of the United States without exceeding the limits of expression which a patriotic citizen desires to observe when speaking of the Chief Magistrate of the Nation. It was with surprise and regret that the country received the President's announcement of his desire for a "challenge" and the reference to his "fighting blood," accompanied with a wish for an opportunity to "let it have scope," in his speech at Boston on the occasion of his brief visit to the United States. The people were expecting a clear and dispassionate exposition of the purport and the relation to the interests of the Nation of the document that had been sent from Paris as a project of a "League of Nations," and were prepared to receive the President's message regarding it with respectful attention in order to form a judgment of its merits. There seems to have been no occasion for a belligerent mood on the part of anyone, and this unexpected display of personal feeling appeared to those who desired to receive enlightenment on a subject of such great consequence as a rather grotesque method of approaching the discussion of universal peace.

That some new international undertaking should result from the experience of the Great War is evident to all thoughtful men, but the problem of the nature and extent of new and perpetual obligations to be assumed by the United States regarding other countries, is too serious to be treated in a light manner, and the solution of it too heavily charged with consequences to be accepted without careful consideration by all whom the consequences will affect.

The circumstances in which this country has been placed by the President's decision to carry into execution a policy in contradiction to all the traditions of the Republic find no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parallel in the history of any free people in the enjoyment of constitutional liberty. They recall the occasion when the former German Emperor, without consulting the constitutionally authorized officers of the German Empire, undertook, in his private capacity, to carry on negotiations with a foreign Power by procuring an alliance with the Czar of Russia; and the other occasion when the same sovereign attempted to influence the sentiment of the British people by an expression of his personal views in a published interview, and was called to account by the Reichstag. In these instances of purely personal diplomacy, which have been severely criticized both in Germany and elsewhere, the sovereign merely assumed that he had a perfect right to propose and carry into effect what he believed would be for the good of his country. The ground of objection to his conduct was not that as sovereign he did not have charge of the foreign relations of the Empire, a duty which the Imperial Constitution imposed upon him, but that he had exceeded the constitutional limits in his method of procedure; in brief, that his authority was not personal but official, and that officially he could speak and act only in conjunction with other officers also speaking and acting in their joint capacity.

It is, of course, not disputed that the President of the United States is charged by the Constitution with the duty, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," of negotiating treaties with foreign governments. It has, however, been customary, and it is the evident intent of the Constitution of the United States, that in the process of treaty-making, even in the most ordinary matters,—much more in the case of the settlement of the most important issue regarding the peace and safety of the world that has arisen in the present generation, or is likely to arise,—the President should not proceed alone. As Hamilton wrote in the *Federalist,* when urging the adoption of the Constitution, "The history of human conduct does not warrant that exalted opinion of human virtue which would make it wise in a nation to commit interests of so delicate and momentous a kind, as those which concern its intercourse with the rest of the world, to the sole disposal of a magistrate created and circumstanced as would be the President of the United States."

If this caution was deemed necessary regarding decisions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

affecting merely those matters relating in a general way to "intercourse with the rest of the world," what is to be said of a scheme to revolutionize the whole plan of international relationship, involving permanent and unalterable bonds of obligation between many nations as yet unnamed in the covenant, and thus far non-existent as established and generally recognized States?

Certainly, it could never have been contemplated by the founders of this Republic that one man, however great, and wise, and noble, should be empowered to pool the interests of this nation with those of other nations unless "by and with the advice and consent" of at least one branch of the representatives of the people, and thus to commit both of the legislative branches of the Government and the property and persons of the people to undertakings incapable of previous precise definition and in terms so broad that they might easily give rise to controversy and even to ultimate dissent and refusal.

Could it have been imagined that any person honored with the prerogatives and responsibilities of the presidency of the United States would even presume, in defiance of public opinion, to disregard the precedents of more than a century, and insist upon leaving his country repeatedly, and for long periods, in the midst of important public business, and appoint himself, accompanied by a retinue of persons chosen only by himself and wholly subservient to his dictates, as the personal negotiator, not of an immediate peace, —which alone might justify an unusual procedure, in order that the victors in a frightful war might promptly guard themselves against future aggression in the manner desired by those most exposed to danger,—but to impose upon other nations, as the price of future American aid and friendship, a plan of world reconstruction evolved from his own inner consciousness, which had not only never been publicly discussed by his fellow-citizens, but had never been disclosed even to the co-ordinate branch of the Government in the exercise of the treaty-making power?

Such a course could certainly never be taken "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." And it should not be overlooked that in the making of treaties it is "advice," as well as consent, which is authorized as essential to the proper performance of that duty.

Who of our American presidents has ever placed such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confidence in himself, or so presumed upon the confidence of others, as to demand the privilege of acting without such advice, or would exercise it without diffidence and every fortification of wise counsel, even if urged by his fellow-citizens to assume this responsibility?

In Europe, where the head of a State has great authority, no sovereign would undertake so large an enterprise. Once, by accident, the late King of England, Edward VII, whose discretion was unusual, met and held conversation with another sovereign, without the presence of a minister. There were no negotiations, and probably there was no utterance on either side beyond what the courtesies of casual intercourse demanded; but immediately there was public criticism in the London newspapers of this disregard of the British Constitution, and it was demanded as a matter of public right that the sovereign should not hold such conversation without the presence of a minister. There was probably only one sovereign in Europe who would resent such criticism, and he is no longer a sovereign.

An American President, it may be thought, is himself his own prime minister. This is an error. He is a definitely delegated representative of a sovereign people, possessing no powers which are not included in the constitutional designation of his functions, by which also they are strictly limited. By etiquette he ranks with royalty in a foreign country because he is the head of a State; but in point of influence he is for that reason more potent than any minister. An American President is never embarrassed by the presence of his ministers. A prime minister is the creature of a Parliament, and subject to its will. He can be overthrown at any moment, and a successor takes his place. A President can be impeached—a difficult process—but he is as secure in the exercise of power, within constitutional limits, during his term of office, as a treasure is secure in a steel safe-deposit vault behind the trusty bolts that will be withdrawn only when the time-lock releases them.

From a European point of view, the President must be taken at his own self-valuation. It is naturally assumed that what he promises he can perform. When, therefore, he states what the United States will do no one questions his powers of execution. He carries the destiny of the country in his closed hand more effectively than any king or emperor under a parliamentary régime could do.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While an American President has this advantage over any minister or even any sovereign in Europe, the President of the United States well understands the embarrassment of the heads of other governments at a moment when combined strength is needed to facilitate an issue from a condition of emergency. Without America the balance of power that has won the war would be lost and the victory forfeited.

In such circumstances the President does not hesitate to speak disparagingly of European governments. Unless they adopt a "League of Nations," he declares openly, they are likely to be brushed aside. The "people" he affirms are the ultimate authority, and it is to the people that he appeals. It is upon this popular pressure that he depends to influence the governments, of whose spontaneous inclination he expresses doubts. "The nations of the world," he said in his speech on landing at Boston, "have set their heads to do a great thing, and they are not going to slacken their purpose." But he hastens to explain that he does not mean the governments. Having received the plaudits of the multitude as a distinguished foreigner and apostle of liberty, when he made his tour of Europe before the Peace Congress assembled, he has made evident to his own mind something which the governments seem not to have been aware of before, but with which he affirms they are duly impressed now. "When I speak of the nations of the world," he says, "I do not speak of the governments of the world. I speak of the peoples who constitute the nations of the world. They are in the saddle and they are going to see to it that if their present governments do not do their will some other governments shall. And the secret is out and the present governments know it."

What is the nature of this "secret"? With whom has our President been conferring? The governments now also are said to participate in this disclosure, but apparently it did not come originally from them. It is something that has been forced upon them through popular pressure, and it is upon this that the President counts as the basis of the "League of Nations" which the governments will be compelled to accept or give way to others. His confidence is not founded upon those with whom he has been negotiating, but upon those who will have "other governments" decide the question if their will is not obeyed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who are those "other governments"? Are they governments foreign to those people—ours for example—who are to force obedience to the popular will, or are they revolutionary governments yet to be created? Would the President of the United States be pleased to have any foreign potentate, or even an ambassador, tour the United States, making popular speeches in our cities, and then make such observations regarding the American Government with which the stranger had come to negotiate?

Judging by the President's estimate of the European nations—and he is speaking not of governments but of nations now, by which he says he means "peoples"—Europe is sadly in need of a guardian, but would prove an unruly ward.

Here is his graphic picture of the nations with which, in the future, he desires us to be closely associated, and by whose collective judgment he wishes our future policy to be determined:

> You understand that the nations of Europe have again and again clashed with one another in competitive interest. It is impossible for men to forget these sharp issues that were drawn between them in times past. It is impossible for men to believe that all ambitions have all of a sudden been foregone. They remember territory that was coveted; they remember rights that it was attempted to extort; they remember political ambitions which it was attempted to realize—and, which they believe that men have come into a different temper, they cannot forget these things, and so they do not resort to one another for a dispassionate view of the matters in controversy.

If this is a just estimate of the European nations, it would appear to be the part of wisdom for a distant people to keep as far as possible from intervention in any of their quarrels. The picture, however, is drawn with no discrimination, and is as erroneous in substance as it is unjust in its implications. It is monstrous to include innocent Belgium, which did resort to the good faith of others for a dispassionate view; or France, which has been made the victim of every crime; or Great Britain, which has played a noble part in the endeavor to avoid strife and to save the world from the ruin of civilization, in the picture of a discordant and distrustful Europe which the President has drawn in the paragraph just quoted. These countries have stood together, and fought together, amidst great sacrifices, to put down aggression; and this is the first time that anyone has revived the unhappy memories of a past that has been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

buried, to question the solidarity and mutual confidence that existed in the Entente before the President went to Europe. It is injurious and unpardonable to try to make it appear that America, and America alone, can harmonize a discordant Europe, and lead the music in a new concert of world power. The nations of the Entente and the governments of the Entente are as capable of pursuing high ideals and creating the conditions of peace as America herself, and are as much disposed to do so. It is both sophistical and reprehensible to appeal to American pride, and to exalt American conceit, by detraction from the capacities of Powers with problems far more serious to solve than any which confront this nation.

The truth is that America very tardily, but with abundant and long disregarded warning of what awaited her, finally came into the war in time to prevent the defeat of the Entente by adding a fresh force to tip the scale of the balance of power, and it was this new preponderance that won the war.

It will require the maintenance of that superior counterpoise to conclude and enforce a victorious peace. That is the immediate problem, and the only immediate problem. The imposing of just, but necessarily punitive, terms of peace on Germany and her allies would secure the peace of the world for a long time to come. Ulterior questions of international reorganization could then be discussed calmly and effectively in the light of the conditions which would prevail when peace had been concluded and the power to enforce it had been demonstrated. Until that power can be proved to exist by actual achievement, the speculations about permanent and universal peace are mere excursions in dreamland.

Instead of promoting peace, the efforts of the President of the United States to impose his own views and to array the populations of other countries behind them by bringing pressure—if that has actually been the case—upon other governments have seriously impeded and obstructed the only peace in which the world is really interested at this time, and for the need of which whole nations are dying with hunger and are kept in an abnormal and dangerous state of mind as a climax to their physical distress. In the meantime the Entente is weakening through discouragement and the enemy is reorganizing, if not for resistance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at least to display a refractory attitude toward conditions of peace that could at one time have been easily imposed.

There is no division of opinion in the United States regarding the duty of this country to stand firmly with our Allies in this war in the complete suppression of a common enemy and the maintenance of a peace thus imposed. Yet the President raises the sophistical question, "If America were at this juncture to fail the world, what would become of it? I do not mean any disrespect to any other great people when I say that America is the hope of the world, and if she does not justify that hope the results are unthinkable. Men will be thrown back upon the bitterness of disappointment not only, but the bitterness of despair. All nations will be set up as hostile camps again; the men at the peace conference will go home with their heads upon their breasts, knowing that they have failed—for they were bidden not to come home from there until they did something more than sign a treaty of peace."

What necessity is there for raising the impertinent and defamatory question, What would become of the world if America failed to do her duty? The American people have no thought of failing in the performance of their duty, and the description of what would happen if they did fail is superfluous. The real question is, What *is* America's duty? and it is not answered by a dogmatic assertion that America must make herself responsible for the future peace of the whole world, which may be beyond her powers of accomplishment. Her plain duty is to do now what she can do, which is by loyal coöperation with her Allies to impose and maintain immediate peace on a common enemy growing every day more dangerous.

The President has never frankly spoken of the Powers with whom we have together fought in this war as our "Allies." For a long time he was in a state of cold neutrality regarding them. Gradually they became in his mind "associates," but they have never seemed nearer than that; and to-day his aim is to place them, after this intimate companionship in action and suffering, in which our soldiers and sailors have fought side by side with British, and French, and Belgian, and Italian combatants to win a common cause, in a "general association of nations" to which he would have all peoples irrespective of their affinities equally belong.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The President's mind seems always to dwell in a region of abstractions. The concrete does not appeal to him. Overlooking the pressing necessity of immediate peace, the one imperative duty in this regard has not been performed. His policy has been, and is, world reconstruction first and peace afterward. This policy has obstructed and prevented the action by the Entente Allies that should have been taken, and would have been taken, but for his personal interference. It was the right of the Entente Allies, as victors, to impose an immediate peace upon the enemy; and it was the duty of the United States not only to aid in this, but to secure the execution and preservation of the peace after the treaty of peace was signed. It could not then be said of it, as the President says, that such a treaty would be a "scrap of paper."

If, in November, 1918, when the German armies were defeated in the field and called for an armistice, a peace had been signed during that month at Berlin, Germany and her allies would have known that they were beaten, and that the terms insuring a European peace would be imposed and would have to be carried out. Among those terms it would have been proper to include this: that any attempt on the part of the Central Powers or their Allies to make an unprovoked attack upon any of the Entente Powers would be regarded as an attack upon all, including the United States. That would have been the honorable way for America to have treated her co-belligerents in the war against a common enemy, and that alone would have been sufficient to dispel all thoughts of war for a long time to come. Peace once secured, the new nationalities would have had an opportunity to complete their organization under conditions of peace, and Russian Bolshevism could have been taken in hand and suppressed by a united Europe. France would have been made at once secure. Without this, the war has been virtually lost. That security was the first and most pressing problem, and it is still unsolved.

And what is the situation that has been allowed to develop? I quote the words of one of the most candid and best informed observers of the proceedings of the Peace Conference now in Paris. "Mr. Wilson came to Paris," says Mr. Frank H. Simonds,

> Resolved that there should be a league of nations. * * * Finding French interest and French attention fixed upon the salvation of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

France rather than upon the formulation of the principles of a league of nations, Mr. Wilson and those associated with him were not successful in concealing their disappointment or their disapproval of what seemed to them a particularistic national policy. When France as a whole asked Mr. Wilson to go and see her devastated regions, that he might understand her heart, he returned a cold and unequivocal negative. I do not think that any single act of any man ever carried with it profounder disappointment than Mr. Wilson's refusal to go to the northern regions and see what the boche had done.

And we have had, week after week, a slow but sure change in French emotion with respect to the President. He was hailed by the little people of France as a savior. He was hailed as a man who came from another world to deliver France and other peoples of the world from the shadow of tragedy which had been, and little by little his course here had the effect at least of creating the impression that he cared nothing for the life or death of France, that he was not concerned with those things which the tragic years of war had burned into the soul of every French man and woman.

I do not think it possible accurately to represent how profound was the disappointment of France at this course of the American President. A sense first of desertion and then of utter isolation crept into the French heart, as more and more the American attitude toward France passed from mere coldness with respect of French necessities to open criticism and hardly concealed suspicion. I do not think one would exaggerate by saying that three months ago France believed the war won and to-day, as a result of what has occurred here in the peace conference, there is something amounting to real terror lest the war shall be lost after all, and France left alone again across the pathway of a Germany increased in power and population by the last war.

These words were received from Paris on the very day when the President was delivering his speech in Boston, in which there was not one word regarding the sufferings and peril of France, but the intimation of changes of government in Europe, if a "League" was not accepted. At the same time the newspapers were informing us that the Constitution finally assented to as a project for a "League" is by no means a spontaneous embodiment of the desires of the fourteen nations alleged to have adopted it. We were assured that the "League" had been "on the rocks," because Monsieur Clemenceau had urged that France could not subscribe to a compact that did not offer her security; whereupon the situation for the "League" was saved by an American diplomat's sending for Monsieur Bourgeois and saying to him "that President Wilson was very near the limit of his patience in the matter," was very much chagrined by the attitude of the French press, which was pleading for the security of France, and would perhaps

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drop the whole question of a "League of Nations." It was then put squarely to Monsieur Bourgeois that he would have to decide between this compact and no "League" at all. After consulting Monsieur Clemenceau, Monsieur Bourgeois reported his reluctant acceptance of the proposed covenant rather than permit France to be thus deprived of the good will of America.

It is known that when the President went to Europe the main object of his going was that he might be able to say privately what he did not wish to write or to discuss openly. He had in mind a programme of universal peace which he had gradually thought out in isolation without giving it full publicity, based on the conception of a "League of Nations," a project which has been strongly advocated for some years by the "League to Enforce Peace." Such a "League," as foreshadowed by the President in his public speeches, involved a "general association of nations" that would mutually guarantee the independence and the territorial integrity of all its members; that would secure freedom of navigation upon the seas, alike in peace and war; and that, by the removal of economic barriers, would establish equality of trade conditions for all nations.

At the time this idea of a "League" was conceived, it was intended as a medium for reconciling the differences made prominent in the Great War by securing a compromise peace which might afterward be made the basis of a permanent peace. This was the inner meaning of the "fourteen points." These rubrics were formulated at a time when victory on either side was thought by the President to be still doubtful, and when his original idea of "a peace without victory" may have seemed to him the best method of demonstrating the utter futility of war.

The problem at that time seemed to him to be, to formulate a plan that could be accepted by both sides by promising to secure in the future the most important interests of all the belligerents. The wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 was to be "righted, in order that peace might once more be made secure in the interest of all." Belgium was to be "evacuated and restored" as a sovereign State, without any stipulation of indemnity. In return, since the new "association" was to be "general," Germany was to have a place in it, and also to enjoy the *status quo* determined by the peace after surrendering the conquered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

territories, together with all the advantages which the plan implied. Great Britain was to abandon her naval supremacy under the protection of the "League." Armaments were to be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial judgment of all colonial claims was to be assured, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the claims of the government whose title is to be determined.

Thus, it was imagined, the gates of the temple of Janus would be permanently closed. There would never be any more war, because there would remain no just causes for war. As to the unjust ambitions of nations, these would of course wholly disappear!

As a plan for universal and permanent peace, this is comparable with the great proposal attributed by Sully to Henry IV of France, and should no doubt appeal to the imagination and the sympathies of peaceloving men in a similar manner; but, like that and other great and noble conceptions for world reorganization, its defect was that it did not reckon with the fact that no Great Power was ready to accept it in its entirety except as the result of military defeat.

The truth of this last statement is demonstrated by the events which have followed. When the fourteen rubrics of peace were proposed, in January, 1918, seeing that they embodied a purely mediatory proposal, Germany was ready to accept five of the fourteen points, but these were the five that the Entente Allies were not willing to accept because they implied that Germany was to be treated and trusted as if she were a just and pacific nation. In October, 1918, when the certainty of her defeat dawned upon her, and her allies were failing her, Germany, in the belief that all fourteen were intended in a mediatorial sense, was ready to accept them all "as a basis for discussion." The Entente Allies when invited, not wishing to alienate the President, whose support was necessary in the war, also accepted them with one exception, in the belief that the conditions of the armistice would be sufficiently strong to show that a victory had been won, and on that basis peace was possible with honor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When the President went to Europe, he hoped to persuade the Entente Allies to accept his entire plan. He intended to convince the British Government that it would be in the interest of Great Britain to accept his idea of the "freedom of the seas" under international control, for if this were not accepted, the United States would in future prepare to hold the supremacy of the seas; and, to impress this point, he directed the Secretary of the Navy to propose immediately an extensive programme of naval construction, and through him exhorted Congress to hasten in passing the necessary legislation, subject to its non-execution if the "League" were formed.

If the British Government had resented this proposal, the consequences to the Entente would have been serious, indeed; but, retorting that, as the two nations were fast and inseparable friends, the building of a greater navy by the United States would afford to Great Britain a new sense of security, the agile-minded Premier convinced the President that British sea-power could not be a menace to neutral nations, since, under the "League," there would be no neutrals in any war in which Great Britain could engage; and the President is reported to have declared that "the joke was on him for not thinking of this," and the "freedom of the seas" is thus settled!

With regard to the "general association" promised in the fourteenth point of the President's peace programme, a similar renunciation has been made, as it was certain from the beginning it would have to be. Nothing could induce France, after what she has endured, to enter any "general association" of which Germany is a member; and of course Russia,—although arrangements were made to negotiate with the Bolsheviki, in spite of Monsieur Clemenceau's declaration that France would never associate with assassins,—could not be included. Germany's recent allies will also, no doubt, if the "League" comes into being, and probably some other Powers, have to sit a long time in the anteroom, even if they are on the waiting list. As a scheme of world organization, therefore, the President's plan is far from being accepted, although so recently as his speech in Manchester on December 30th, he voiced his conception of what the "League" should be in the words: "If the future had nothing for us but a new attempt to keep the world at a right poise by a balance of power, the United States would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

take no interest, because she will join no combination of Powers which is not a combination of all of us."

It is precisely such a combination as he here repudiates which the President now insists it is our sacred duty to join, or remain "selfish and provincial." It is Monsieur Clemenceau who has had his way regarding the "balance of power"; for the "League", as the President represents, would be "a scrap of paper" if the power of the United States were not thrown into the scale to render preponderant this combination of four Great Powers and some little ones, which latter will need but not afford protection.

From the moment when the President saw the "joke" regarding British naval supremacy, the British Government became as eager for the "League" as the President had been. In this the Government was joined by the British press and British public opinion, for it was seen that the adherence to such a combination, with the United States as a member, would create a preponderant balance of power.

With an American alliance in which the United States would assume equal responsibility with the European Entente Powers for the peace and control of the rest of Europe, a "League" would undoubtedly be a great security to them all. It would, in effect, place the balance of power entirely in the hands of the "League."

It is not surprising, therefore, that Great Britain, with vast imperial interests in every part of the world exposed to attack, should become an eager advocate of the proposed combination. Retaining her naval supremacy, acquiring no new obligations, and relieved of a share of her responsibility, Great Britain is much interested in bringing the "League" into being. General Smuts, a former Boer officer who had become an ardent imperialist, in order to satisfy the President's desire for a "League" of some kind, had made ready for use in the Peace Conference a detailed plan that would be acceptable to Great Britain. That plan, which contained a provision for the administration of the colonies conquered from Germany, now figures more largely in the proposed "Constitution of a League of Nations" than any other. The idea of administration by "Mandatories" ingeniously extricates those who have taken the German colonies from the dilemma of either stultifying their claims to democracy by annexing them outright or returning them to Germany, by placing them under the ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ministration—temporary, no doubt—of other Powers, preferably of the United States, which would thus be drawn into the complications of a joint imperialism in distant parts of the world.

It is quite intelligible that, although it was assumed in Europe that the President speaks with authority for the purpose and policy of the United States, there is in this country no corresponding unanimity regarding the obligations which the United States should undertake to assume in remote and turbulent parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa, or the islands of the Pacific.

In the United States it is clearly perceived that we should be an unequal partner in the combination that is proposed; and the President not only admits this, but urges it as a reason for our accepting new and unpredictable responsibilities.

In stating the case thus candidly, there is no intention to disregard the strong friendship which has developed with Great Britain during the latter years of the war. On the contrary, it is timely to emphasize the wish that this friendship may always continue to be close, loyal, and permanent; but it is the part of wisdom to avoid those complications which, in circumstances that may arise, might tend to alienate two great nations by too close an intimacy in affairs that separately concern them. Great Britain and America have many great interests, as well as many strong bonds of sympathy and understanding, in common. We have among the nations no better friend, unless it is France; for which we have a particular affection of long date and recent demonstration. The British fleet, it is true, annoyed our shipping and embarrassed our trade early in the war, but before the war was ended it became our faithful protector and copartner. Anywhere in the world, on sea or land, we feel safe where the British flag floats over us, and we should not wish to see it lowered. But before we could agree that we would send our sons and brothers across the seas to fight to keep it wherever it floats outside Great Britain itself,—which to many of us is a mother-land,—we should have to ask ourselves whether we or our fathers would have fought to place it everywhere in the world where the policy of the British Empire has carried it.

Nations and governments, like individuals, from their very nature, must limit their responsibilities. Without this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they weaken and destroy their own capacity for usefulness. It is necessary to be strong before we can help the weak, and we render no real service to those for whom we become entirely responsible. It is for this reason that we ought not as a nation to permit ourselves to be influenced by an appeal to our national pride or the personal sentiments which might properly control us in affairs of a private nature.

The personal experience of the President during his unprecedented ovation in Europe, as the head of a nation that turned the scale in the war, is of a kind that appeals powerfully to the emotional element in his nature. He has led the Entente nations to expect great things of America, and he undoubtedly feels responsible for realizing these expectations. He has held up to enraptured audiences that have thronged to see and hear him the vision of a reconstructed world. Naturally they have had faith in him. They were longing for peace, and he has pictured to them Utopia. He returned to America with a demand for the realization of his promises.

The urgent appeal to the United States to adhere to a "League" without debate, without hesitation, and without regard to any question of national interest or expediency, is the almost necessary psychological consequence of the President's self-imposed activity. The Constitution presented for adoption is not, it is true, the realization of his original purpose; but it is a result of it,—the nearest approach to it that he could achieve. To reject it utterly would be a repudiation of his leadership. The acceptance of it, at least in substance, is necessary to his prestige. It is for this that his "fighting blood" is aroused. It is for this that the President's public and his still more fervid and less parliamentary private denunciations of all critics and opponents, have seemed to him justified. The rôle must be carried to its logical conclusion.

In commending immediate action the President employs none of the arguments which would be expected of a statesman. He has found in Europe, he reports, a general confidence in the disinterestedness of America as a country of great ideals. This is the chief impression of his experience. He said to his Boston audience: "Every interest seeks out first of all, when it reaches Paris, the representatives of the United States. Why? Because—and I think I am stating the most wonderful fact in history—because there is no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nation in Europe that suspects the motives of the United States."

It is frankly admitted that all other nations have "interests," that they are objects of contention among themselves, and that all these nations turn to the United States as a great disinterested benefactor. The United States alone is presumed to have no interests, or to act without regard to them. The President never mentions them. He even scorns a reference to them. His appeal to the country is as emotional as his experience has been. We should, he affirms, act in this great emergency "without regard to the things that may be debated as expedient."

There is grave danger to our national life in resting a decision upon an appeal to the emotions of the people. In the past our statesmen have not hesitated to defend the national interests entrusted to their keeping. These interests are now deliberately excluded from view and sunk in the advocacy of a vague internationalism. This is proposed ostensibly in behalf of "peace", but it will have other consequences. The prospect is confessedly one of interminable suspicion, intervention, and restricted independence. In the end, nations will settle their differences in the manner that seems to them at the time in accordance with their highest interest. Nothing can more effectually breed strife than to mix them up in one another's disputes,—disputes which, if the nations desire mediation, can be more readily composed by a free, strong, united, and independent America, whose word of counsel would be listened to, than by an America bound to the control of a group of Powers, constituting perhaps a third of Europe, in which her voice would be drowned in the general clamor.

We have, of course, a great interest in peace. We have a special and immediate interest in a conclusive and permanent settlement of the actual issues of the war, in which our honor as well as our interests as a nation is bound up. We cannot without disloyalty desert our Allies so long as we have a common enemy, but this does not make it necessary to assume new obligations in other parts of the world. Unless we assume these, the President assures us, America "will have to keep her power for those narrow, selfish, provincial purposes which seem so dear to some minds that have no sweep beyond the nearest horizon."

It is difficult to see the reason for this reproach, and it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

little short of exasperating to those who saw America's duty and urged the performance of it long before the President's vision had swept beyond the nearest horizon, when he was urging neutrality in the midst of international outrage, not only on the part of the Government but in the thoughts as well as the deeds of citizens; when he was still asking what the war was about, and declaring that we had nothing to do with its causes or its results; when he was advising a peace without victory; when he was elected to the Presidency because he had kept us out of war; when he was still regarding strict accountability as implying nothing more than liability to pay a money indemnity for American lives, destroyed ruthlessly in violation of International Law and every instinct of humanity, and yet did not see that preparation for war alone could rescue the nation from contempt. It is, therefore, impossible not to resent the attempt by mere rhetoric and insinuation to silence the free speech of men who are entitled to be heard on international and constitutional questions affecting the destiny of the nation and its unveiled future by a public reference to them as "minds that have no sweep beyond the nearest horizon"; even when this is spoken by the President of the United States.

It is not the path of peace that is being pursued, but a course that is obstructive of peace. The Entente that has saved Europe has been strained by the introduction of new and irrelevant issues, many months have been consumed in deliberations and journeys not related to the ending of the war, and the American people are in danger of being seriously divided over a question that can be rightly settled only on the basis of an existing peace, when they may act with freedom and not under compulsion. If the world is to be made safe for free nations, it will be by an Entente of Free Nations. While that lasts there is hope; but if that ceases to exist, hope will have departed. The moment bonds are felt they will destroy the power that has won the war. By whatever name it is called, there is no third condition between super-government and the independence of free peoples. Discussion over speculations about such a possibility are but a waste of time; for the free nations do not desire a super-government. There remains, therefore, no possibility but an Entente of Free Nations, however it may be named, and our one solicitude should be that it be not destroyed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To the word "League" there is in itself no objection, except to the bondage which the word implies. For the improvement and enforcement of International Law, for the pacific settlement of disputes, for aid to free nations exposed to danger, for the suppression of Bolshevism, and for international bodies to deal with these subjects, there is great need. But these ends cannot be accomplished by mere paper machinery, which presents only a new cause of disagreement—a new occasion for difference of opinion and of strife. If the ideals of civilization are not safe in the hands of the free nations, acting freely, they will remain in danger. What happens in the future will depend upon what the free nations will to do; and the essential element in their unity, their security, and their effective cooperation is precisely their freedom.

DAVID JAYNE HILL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FRENCH PEACE COMMISSIONERS

By MARCEL KNECHT

THE representatives of France at the Paris Conference typify certain qualities of the French people which we as Frenchmen have come to believe as thoroughly characteristic.

The President of the French Republic, Mr. Raymond Poincaré, who opened the Peace Conference by a masterly speech, represents the lofty and supple intelligence of his country; Premier Georges Clémenceau—a wounded of the war—President of the Delegation, personifies, in the opinion of the world, as well as France, patriotism in its noblest aspect. The Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Stephen Pichon, and the Minister of Finance, Mr. Klotz, contribute extraordinary diplomatic knowledge, lucid reasoning, and the spirit of justice.

A great friend of America during the war, Mr. André Tardieu, not only stands out splendidly as the champion of the courageous youth of 1914, but above all, as the creative energy needed for the moral and material reconstruction of the nation.

Ambassador Jules Cambon, better acquainted with perfidious German diplomacy than any other Frenchman, and who learned to appreciate the United States while he was in Washington, combines with his wisdom and idealism a fund of good sense.

Another eminent Ambassador, Mr. J. J. Jusserand, although he takes no part in the Conference, accompanied President Wilson, whose fellow-countryman he might have been had not his love for France been stronger than his affection for the land of Washington and Emerson.

Two diplomats, the pride of the Quai d'Orsay, Messrs. Dutasta, Ambassador to Switzerland, and Philippe Ber-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thelot, founder of the Official Bureaus of Information abroad and Director of Political Affairs, unite rare experience with the clear-sighted vision that is needed for a task of such tremendous import.

Very close to the Delegation, Mr. Léon Bourgeois, author of a draft of a Society of Nations, and a high authority in matters of law, contributes a wide humanitarianism.

In the Parliament, which is only separated from the Quai d'Orsay by the residence of Mr. Paul Deschanel, the Commission on Foreign Affairs has great figures of former Cabinets, Mr. Aristide Briand, Mr. Louis Barthou, Mr. Henry Franklin Bouillon. And dominating the Conference itself, our beloved Marshal Foch, our victorious generalissimo, symbolizes in the present and in the past, better than Richelieu and Louis XIV, better than Bonaparte and Gambetta, the immortal genius of the land that gave birth to Roland, Joan of Arc and Guynemer.

These then are the men who are working side by side with their allies and comrades to clarify in terms of lasting peace the purposes that the guns spoke out across the fields of France.

President Raymond Poincaré—I.

It is many a day since at Bar-le-Duc, in that historic region of the Meuse, a young boy with eyes of singular gravity, intelligent mouth, and forehead that showed even then his strength of purpose, was studying eagerly and systematically under the guidance of a most admirable mother. Such a mother of France and Lorraine she was as truly represents all those who throughout history have created and cultivated the intelligence and heart of the children of France. The little boy from the Meuse had constantly before his eyes the strong and simple life of his parents, whose existence was a series of sacrifices joyfully accepted for the greater benefit of those who were to carry on the family.

The Poincaré family were famous in the department of the Meuse for their intelligence. At Bar-le-Duc, and afterwards at the University of Nancy, worthy successor of the Strasbourg alma mater, the young Raymond Poincaré was a source of astonishment to his masters on account of his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

insatiable desire for scholarship and capacity for sounding the depths of knowledge; above all, for his vast intelligence, with its marvelous suppleness in adapting itself to the varied aspects of life.

As the young University graduate, somewhat weakened by nights devoted to study but happy in the consciousness of knowledge gained, spent some months at the home of his uncle, Dr. Poincaré, a distinguished physician of Nancy, and in the more polished setting of the capital of Lorraine he was better able than in the provincial milieu of Bar-le-Duc, to give full vent to his creative imagination and to the fancy of his literary dreams.

The sons of the Meuse, like those of Lorraine, possess wonderful qualities: they brave every danger and defy every obstacle. When an obstacle does happen to be unsurmountable, they bide their time, wait in silence, prepare for attack, and sometimes at the end of forty-seven years one of them reconquers his beloved city of Metz and the annexed territory.

This extraordinary optimism, this indifference of the true son of the soil to the eternal changes brought about by time and destiny, was also taught to the young schoolboy, Poincaré, by the history of his province.

Poincaré served his term of military duty, and in 1879-1880 was first a private, and then a corporal in the famous 26th Infantry Regiment, one of the four glorious regiments of the Iron Division.

An intelligence sustained by patriotism and sane democracy will expand, then soar, then dominate. The excellent student, the undergraduate who carried off every honor, the good soldier, was soon to become one of the greatest lawyers of France and of Europe. Working side by side with such men as Millerand, Waldeck-Rousseau, Viviani, Mr. Raymond Poincaré brought to his profession an extraordinary legal diagnosis, an irrefutable documentation, prodigious good sense, a profound knowledge of his mother tongue and masterly oratory, and to this array of qualifications may be added a clear voice, vibrant with nervous strength, capable of moving the most sceptical audiences. It is a characteristic of all the Poincarés, from the great scientist, Henri Poincaré, to the President and his brother, Lucien, General Director of Public Education, that the eyes, energetic and serious, slant slightly up-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wards towards the temples, giving to the expression an originality that reveals the richness of their imagination.

This imagination of Raymond Poincaré is seen also in a gift for word painting, inspired by the purest classicism —such were the qualities of the lawyer, who soon left the Bar for politics.

First a General Councilor, then Deputy for the Department of Meuse, with Commercy and St. Mihiel, finally a Senator, Mr. Raymond Poincaré was still in the flush of his youth and ardor when he was appointed member of one cabinet after another, showing rare ability as an organizer. Like a true Lorrainer, the new cabinet member would first examine and investigate, and instead of destroying the work of his predecessor, he would improve, renew, and modify it without breaking the necessary links that must unite the unstable present to the past, sacred heritage of the race.

The confidence of the French Parliament and the admiration of the élite gave him in 1912 the important ministry of Foreign Affairs and the presidency of the Council of Ministers, or premiership. After the disquieting threats of Germany in 1904, 1908 and 1911, the Premier in power in 1912 had a very heavy task before him.

The more intelligent Frenchmen, and Mr. Poincaré was at their head, felt that a German attack was impending; the more idealistic refused to believe in it and were generously trying to prepare for world peace by a superior kind of internationalism.

Premier Poincaré, while he secretly longed for the liberation of humanity, did not wish to compromise the immediate security of the country, and through his fortunate negotiations with Great Britain, Russia, and Italy, before relinquishing his premiership in 1913, he had greatly strengthened France's position in Europe.

That same year Raymond Poincaré was triumphantly elected President of the Republic by the French people. France, by allowing her choice to fall on this Lorrainer of great intellect, showed the world in a pacific way that she would continue to struggle for the maintenance of peace, but with dignity and without renouncing anything.

The 1914 elections proved to an astonished world the innocence—the naïveté almost—of the masses of the people, who opposed the deputies in favor of the law for a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

three-year term of compulsory military service. Poincaré had need of all his solid optimism, all his faith in our country to keep from despairing of the future.

After his trip to Russia in July, 1914, he returned suddenly, and acclaimed by the population of Paris, gravely took his place in his beloved France, who realized at last the ineffectiveness of the olive branch and took up the sword of older days, a little rusty in parts, but shining with patriotism.

Then the Barbarians lit their fires of destruction and began their slaughter. And the fire and slaughter went on for over four long years. But like the sacred flame of the Vestals, French intelligence was still burning; it began grouping hostile parties, bringing provinces nearer together, strengthening alliances and Ententes.

During the entire war, this intelligence has never ceased manifesting itself in the councils of the nation. Foch, Joffre, and Pétain never appealed to it in vain; Viviani called it into play to put on a solid basis the "Sacred Union," which we used to speak of before the war as the "Franco-French Entente." Briand, Ribot, Painlevé, and especially Clémenceau, realized that they must coöperate with this permanent force, which was protecting Right.

Several fine books on education, patriotism, the soul of French democracy, made the name of Poincaré, already famous as that of a statesman, rank also among professional writers. The French Academy, that illustrious assembly of all our national glories, admitted him within doors that have ever been jealously guarded by dignity, taste and tradition.

Although the Constitution does not vest the President of the French Republic with the same powers as the American Constitution gives the President of the United States, yet Mr. Raymond Poincaré, since August 1st, 1914, has weathered the furious storms that have shaken his country, and has held the helm with a firm hand, eyes ever fixed on the distant port of Victory.

MARCEL KNECHT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS GERMANY BANKRUPT?

BY HAROLD G. MOULTON

Is Germany bankrupt? Was it her staggering national indebtedness and rapidly approaching, if not already existent, financial insolvency that prompted that summary capitulation of the German Government? These questions have been widely discussed in financial and business circles during recent months. They are of more than historical interest. Upon the existing state of industry and finance depend the possibility of an early payment of indemnities for the losses inflicted upon the Allies during the war. Upon Germany's ability, moreover, to return quickly to a normal production and distribution of food and other necessities of life largely depends the spread of Bolshevism in Central Europe. Revolution breeds best in an empty larder.

If the German nation is indeed bankrupt, it is sheer futility on the part of the Allies to attempt to make the Hun pay in the near future,—a bankrupt nation cannot liquidate its obligations. Nay, it is worse than futility, for it would serve to fan into fuller flame the smouldering fires which even now threaten the conflagration of the erstwhile Fatherland. We must obviously either discard the notion that Germany is bankrupt or abandon the idea of an early indemnification of the losses that have been inflicted. The time would therefore seem to be opportune for examining the prevailing belief that Germany is financially insolvent.

In proof of the contention that Germany must have been virtually, if not actually, bankrupt at the end of the war, statistics are usually presented which compare the annual interest charges on the public debt with the annual savings of the nation before the war. It is observed that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the spring of 1918 the interest charges on the German war debt reached the approximate sum of $1,450,000,000 a year, and it is believed that by the end of the year it had reached $2,000,000,000. Now, according to the official estimates of Dr. Helfferich the annual savings of Germany before the war were a little less than $2,000,000,000. Assuming that these savings could not have been increased during the war, Germany was living beyond her income; the annual savings were less than the annual interest.

And besides the annual interest charges it is pointed out that Germany must make provision for the gradual extinguishment of her huge national debt, requiring the setting aside of an annual sinking fund of perhaps $600,000,000 a year. Nor is this all; for there must of course be pensions for the disabled and for the widows and dependents of deceased officers and men—estimated to reach as a minimum $700,000,000 a year. Now add to all this an indemnity of $94,000,000,000, as has been suggested—payable, let us say, at the rate of a billion a year, plus interest on the balance, for ninety-four years. Would it not be enough to drive any nation to economic and political anarchy?

But let us pass by the indemnity—for this is not our present problem—and consider merely the meaning of these statistics of German indebtedness. Do they or do they not—accepting them as authentic—reveal a real national bankruptcy? The analysis that follows is intended to show that these statistics reveal nothing of the kind—that they are almost entirely beside the point.

The fundamental fallacy in these figures of war indebtedness is that they show only one side of the financial accounting involved. The problem of war finance is almost universally approached with the assumption that when a nation borrows, it necessarily borrows from an outside party, who becomes its creditor—just as when an individual borrows he places himself in a position of debtor to another person. The analogy between individual borrowing and national borrowing holds good, however, only so long as the nation borrows by placing its loans in foreign countries. It must be borne in mind that Germany is not financing this war by borrowing from outsiders. It is practically all being done through domestic loans and taxes. When it is pointed out, therefore, that the interest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

charges which Germany has to meet each year are $2,000,000,000, or more, one must reflect that this interest is received by the German people as well as paid by the German people. Similarly, when it is argued that an enormous tax will have to be levied after the war to pay pensions, it must again be reflected that the government in its financing is merely transferring funds from German people to German people. The people of Germany, as a whole, as indicated by the Treasury statistics, merely owe the people of Germany a staggering total of wealth, expressed in monetary terms.

Indeed, where a nation does not borrow anything from abroad, its Treasury statements are in a sense nothing but bookkeeping records. They register in a financial way the value of the goods and services of the nation that during the war have been devoted to public ends. The sum total of all private budgets would in a similar way reveal the total of goods and services that during the war had been devoted to private ends. During four years of war these private budgets would not represent a debt to be paid to some external parties. They would merely be a record of four years' private consumption of wealth, nearly all of which had been produced during these very years. Similarly, the Treasury records of war expenses show the aggregate of four years' public consumption of wealth,—nearly all of which was produced during these very years. This truth that the goods and services devoted to the waging of war were nearly all produced during the war (even in Germany with all her preparedness) must be clearly perceived; for in it lies the explanation of the oft repeated dictum of the economist that, unless a nation borrows abroad, it cannot shift the cost of the war to the future[1]; it must pay as it goes. If, at the end of the war, these private budgetary records were all destroyed, and if the books of the Treasury were burned, would this have any net effect upon the *real* wealth of Germany? Did, in fact, the repudiation by new Russia of the domestic debt of old Russia lessen one iota the existing stock of Russian wealth?

No, national debts owed to the nation's own citizens are merely the paper claims of individuals to ownership of the existing supply of national wealth and to wealth that may be produced in the future. The payment of a

[1] Except as indicated in the third paragraph following.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

domestic debt at the end of the war does not therefore in any sense involve a net reduction in the total wealth of the nation; it means merely that the government will collect, through taxation of the people, funds which will in turn be paid back to the people—that is, to the owners of government bonds and other obligations. Now, if all had contributed equally to the financial support of the war, and if post-bellum taxes were levied in exact proportion to the bond holdings of those who financed the war, the payment of Germany's war debt would be merely a balancing of the books and without economic significance except in so far as it required a large force of people to collect the revenue, make the disbursements, and keep the necessary financial records.

But individuals do not in fact ever contribute to the financing of a war in equal proportions, nor is it ever possible to adjust the incidence of post-war taxation precisely in proportion to individual contributions to war finance. War finance, therefore, always involves readjustments in property and income among the various groups of people who make up the state. It may result in giving to certain classes a larger proportion of the national wealth than before; it may give to others less. But by itself, domestic borrowing has no direct effect upon the immediate total of a nation's wealth.

The real costs of war to a nation are not to be measured in terms of money. They are to be measured rather by the deterioration of plant and equipment; by the exhaustion of natural resources; by the loss of new capital which would have been created had not war diverted the energies of the people from construction to destruction; by the decimation and impoverishment of her population—impoverishment in the sense of being undernourished and in subnormal health conditions; and by the arrested training and development of the youth of the land.

Thus measured, Germany will be seen to be far from bankrupt. At the conclusion of hostilities she had a population nearly equal to that in 1914 (at the outside, two millions less); she still possessed her original agricultural area, though doubtless somewhat impaired as to fertility; and she still possessed her mines of raw materials, her factories, and her transportation lines, though unquestionably much the worse for wear and tear. In short,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when stripped of the monetary camouflage, we find that Germany is still a puissant as well as solvent nation. Indemnity aside, she is in debt to foreign nations scarcely a copper. She has her internal reckonings and financial adjustments to make, to be sure,—no simple problem this,—but she is not in any sense financially insolvent. Given political and economic stability and access on equal terms with other nations to the supplies and to the markets of the world, and a decade might see Germany largely recovered from the economic effects of the war.

HAROLD G. MOULTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PROBLEM OF EASTERN EUROPE

BY JAMES BISSETT PRATT

WHEN the whistles began blowing and the bells began ringing on that memorable first Thursday afternoon of November, we all got out into the street and shouted and shook hands and tore up paper and paraded because peace had come; and it was a bit humiliating to learn, a few hours later, that all our noise and delight had been based upon a false report. That did not matter a great deal to be sure; but it would be infinitely worse than mere humiliation should it develop that our second celebration and the present joy of the whole world over the end of the world war were also based upon a false report. And yet it is surely only too well within the range of possibility that our rejoicing is again premature and that we are today hailing peace when in truth there is no peace. For a large part of our joy in victory is due to our hope that it marks the end not of this war only but of war as such; and should this hope prove fallacious we should have little reason for prolonged congratulation. Yet we seem but dimly aware of the fact that half of the battle is still to be won if the world is to be made really safe for democracy or for anything else. Many of us appear to be convinced that we have a sufficient guarantee for the peace of the world in the fact that all the wicked have been beaten and all the righteous are now in the saddle, and that since the meek at length inherit the earth there is nothing more to fear. It would be superfluous to point out that a large percentage of the previous wars have ended with the same comfortable feeling on the part of the victors; but it may be worth while to indicate one of the many special dangers to the continuance of peace with which the world will certainly be threatened immediately upon the close of the peace conference, unless very definite measures are taken to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

avoid it by the governments and peoples in whose hands rests the making of the coming treaties.

Dangers there are enough in Western Europe—not to mention Eastern Asia; but the danger I have specially in mind is one that springs from the new birth of freedom which as a result of our victory has come to the little nations and oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe. As a natural consequence of their conflict and ours against imperial despotism, sympathy for them has turned into confidence, and confidence is now approximating something like idealization. They were in the right, and they were fighting for their liberties against oppression, and now that they have won, the problem is solved, and we—at any rate we in America—feel we need trouble our heads no more with the affairs of these distant folk, whose outlandish names were till yesterday hardly known to us. As champions of liberty they have made Eastern Europe safe for democracy and they will keep it safe.

Just how secure a guarantee of peace and democracy we really have in these champions of liberty we may be able to decide a little better if we consider the case of the most famous champion of liberty which Eastern Europe has yet produced. Not even Washington nor Patrick Henry are more indissolubly associated, in the minds of most middle-aged Americans, with the idea of the defense of freedom against tyranny than are Kossuth and his brave Hungarians, with whose praises both this country and England were ringing all through the boyhood of most of us. How nobly they fought against oppression, what stalwart apostles of the rights of humanity they showed themselves to be! Up till two or three years ago there were but few Americans who realized that these same champions of liberty, once they got the power into their own hands, had become the most systematic foes that the democracy of the Twentieth Century had to face. The Magyars had indeed vindicated their nationality and won for themselves a thoroughly democratic form of Government; but they used the power they had wrung from their Austrian masters to oppress their own subject peoples as tyrannically as ever they themselves had been oppressed by the Hapsburgs. Since the formation of the *Ausgleich* in 1867 the subject peoples of imperial Austria have been fortunate and free compared with those of democratic Hungary.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It would of course be easy to say that nothing of the sort is to be feared from the newly liberated peoples of today because they are not Magyar; but such an answer would be far too simple. The Magyars oppressed their subject peoples not out of any native tyranny inherent in the Magyar race, but chiefly out of the same intense love of nationality which has been the source of most of the movement for liberation among their subject peoples in the present war. Baser motives no doubt played their part. Politicians like Tisza and Andrassy may have been moved by the desire to retain power in their own little circle, and others no doubt wished to protect vested interests and the "rights of property." But these men had the backing of the rank and file of the Magyars because they all wished Hungary to be a united Magyar land. It was not only men of the Tisza type who sought to root out every vestige of national feeling, not to say independence, among the non-Magyar inhabitants of Hungary. In the year of liberty, 1848, the great Kossuth himself informed the representatives of Croatia that he recognized no Croatian nationality. It was this intense ambition for their own beloved nationality (and not some tyrannous tendency in the Magyar blood as such) that has made Hungary first a glorious example of oppressed liberty struggling against tyranny, and then the most systematic oppressor of the liberties of others that the twentieth century has known.

Now the point which it is necessary to keep in mind is the fact that this same intense feeling for nationality is to be found in most if not all of the newly liberated peoples, and that just as this has been the chief source of strength in their struggle for liberty, it may also easily become a great danger both to the liberty of other peoples, and to the peace of the whole world. This danger is not one of mere probability or guess work; it has long been active. For years before the war began the most radically nationalist party among the Croats was even more venomous toward the Serb minority in Croatia than toward the Magyars. The war, indeed, and the common struggle of all the south Slavs against Austria-Hungary, for a time put an end to this. In November, 1914, Pasic, the Prime Minister of Serbia, announced a programme for the union of all the Southern Slavs, and by the "Declaration of Corfu" in July, 1917, signed by Pasic and Mr. Trumbic, President

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Jugo-Slav Committee, all three branches of the Southern Slavs—Croats, Slovenes, and Serbs, whether subjects of Austria-Hungary or of the Kingdom of Serbia—officially bound themselves into one state. This union was strong so long as pressure from without, applied by a powerful Austria-Hungary, held them together. Almost immediately upon the collapse of Austria, however, the old separatist tendencies of the different nationalities came to the surface. The Declaration of Corfu had acknowledged the Karageorgevic dynasty of Serbia as the monarchs of the future Jugo-Slav state. The Austro-Hungarian Slavs, on second thought and after the removal of the Austro-Hungarian menace, are now not at all certain than a Karageorgevitch will be much better than a Hapsburg. It was for this reason that the Jugo-Slav Committee in the United States not long ago formally repudiated the Declaration of Corfu, and its members came out for a republic. Just what is the position of the Austrian Jugo-Slavs in the home-land is uncertain, further than the fact that they mean to settle the question of the future government of Great Jugo-Slavia in a grand constitutional Assembly. The gift of prophecy is not required to foresee that there will be lively times when this Assembly meets, but further than this, prediction cannot safely go. It is pretty plain, however, that a constitution of the sort likely to be acceptable to the Croats and Slovenes is about the last thing which Pasic and the Karageorgevics desire. They would welcome their brother Slavs with open arms into a kingdom of Greater Serbia just as the Croats and their friends would welcome the Serbs of the kingdom into a new Jugo-Slavian Republic; but the difference between republican and monarchical ideals, which seemed negligible in war time, is likely to prove considerable in the actual formation of a union. For the present, to be sure, the Italian menace has obscured the importance of the constitutional question; but once the danger of a war with Italy is removed, the liberal and conservative, as well as the Catholic and Orthodox, forces are likely to find the problem of union bristling with unrealized difficulties. Some way out may indeed be found; one side may yield for the sake of unity. But the chances of inner peace within a Jugo-Slavia thus constituted do not seem very bright, especially when we remember that Austria, the old common foe, will no longer be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there to soak up the products of Slavic belligerency. For it is hardly to be supposed that the sense of separate nationality which has resisted every hostile influence these last fifteen hundred years in all three of the races is going to be destroyed by the one new and magic word—*Jugoslavia.* If on the other hand no union of the Southern Slavs is brought about, we shall have simply added another nation to the Balkan medley—an addition, moreover, of a peculiarly dangerous nature because of the large number of Serbs in Croatia and Bosnia. No one acquainted with the Southern Slavs could regard such a situation with anything but foreboding.

When we turn from the southern extremity of the old Austro-Hungarian monarchy to what was its northern border we find much the same story repeated. If Kossuth with his Hungarians had a rival in the admiration of the lovers of liberty in the last generation it was Kosciuszko with his Poles. Most Americans are happily ignorant of the fact that the Polish martyrs of liberty, both before and after their conquest by the Austrians, were all but as oppressive toward their own subjects, the Ruthenes, as the Magyars have been toward their Croats, Roumanians and Slovaks. The Ruthenes, being an uneducated and peasant people, with few native leaders, have offered little resistance to their Polish masters; but in the last year of the war they summoned up courage to form a Committee *à la mode,* and appealed to President Wilson and the Allies to be permitted to form an independent state or to join their kinsmen the Ukrainians, across the Russian border. In fact, once Austria was out of the game altogether and Galicia as a whole seemed about to be appropriated by the new united Poland, the Ruthenes saw that it was now or never for them, and accordingly have taken up arms in defense of their national existence. The Poles, strong in the historical fact that before the Dismemberment all Galicia formed a part of Poland, are loud in their demands for its reincorporation in the resuscitated fatherland and terribly shocked at what they call the treason of the Ruthenes. So they are answering blow for blow and a new war is beginning as the old war ends.

But for lack of space, it would be easy to show how the same narrow but intense sentiment of nationality which makes for separatism and jealousy among Magyars, Serbs,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Croats and Poles, dominates the political tendencies among all the peoples, new and old, of Eastern Europe. The breaking up of the Russian, Austrian and Turkish Empires has left an unbroken series of petty states, stretching from the Polar Sea and the Baltic to the Adriatic and the Aegean, each swelling with the sense of nationality, bent upon its own internal unification, and jealous of all real or imaginary encroachments upon its rights. To make matters worse, the races are so split up and intermingled in this Babel-like part of the world, that nearly everyone of these little nations has an "*irredenta*" somewhere near by, buried in one of its neighbor's bosoms, a prolific source of irritation between states that even without it would be only too ready to quarrel. An instance of this which is particularly embarrassing to us is to be found in the relations between Bulgaria, Serbia and Greece. The second Balkan war gave to Greece and Serbia a large amount of territory whose inhabitants are chiefly Bulgarian in both race and sentiment. This violation of the principle of the self-determination of nationalities was made more difficult to deal with by the fact that the diplomats of Bulgaria led her to join the Germans in the Great War. Now that the war is over Serbia and Greece will of course expect their sufferings to be rewarded by some substantial "rectification of frontiers"; and the way which naturally suggests itself for granting these demands is to carve off from wicked Bulgaria some more of her territory to be handed over with its unwilling Bulgarian inhabitants to our little allies. But these three nations are not the only ones among whom the racial problem is certain to make trouble. A similar mixture of races is to be found throughout the Balkans, and in fact is characteristic of the whole region we have been considering. The truth is that instead of settling the Balkan problem, the war has resulted in extending the Balkans in a broad belt right up to the Polar Sea.

The situation seems dismal enough. *Is* there any real hope of a continued peace? One thing at least is plain. No peace of more than a few years' standing is to be looked for on the old principle of a balance of power. History has made it very plain that you cannot balance the Balkans. As we know only too well, moreover, a war arising among them is pretty certain to spread, sooner or later, to their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bigger neighbors on the west. It would, therefore, seem clearly to follow that if the world is to have real peace and not merely an armistice, some new method of treating the problem of Eastern Europe must be devised. I certainly have no panacea to suggest, but two of the conditions of anything like permanent peace must surely be plain to everyone who thinks over the facts. Both of these conditions are, indeed, so obvious as to be commonplace, yet both of them, strangely enough, are repudiated in act by many militarists and "red-blooded patriots" in all the Allied countries. The first condition is the trite yet profound principle that there can be no lasting peace but a just peace. To carve off territory from our foes so as to give it to our friends regardless of the wishes of its inhabitants, to be so moved by sentiment for the newly liberated subjects of Austria-Hungary, Germany or Russia, as to enable them to play the Hapsburg over newly subject peoples, to rearrange the Balkans only on the principle of gratitude for military assistance and with but slight consideration for racial preferences—to make a peace of this sort would be to perpetuate the very evils and dangers which we have fought to destroy, and to raise a whole new litter of little Austria-Hungaries, each a center of racial jealousy and oppression and a breeding-place of future wars. In spite of sentiment and gratitude we must realize that in attempting to reshape the world we are dealing with racial and social forces which resemble the Laws of Nature in the inevitability of their working. If this war has taught us anything it has shown that artificial political arrangements, at this stage of the world's history, are bound sooner or later to defeat themselves; that no peace can be permanent which does not respect the wishes of the peoples concerned, or which fails to treat fairly both "those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just." Such a peace may not square with our greed for revenge, which we like to call a demand for "punitive justice"; but to make any other kind of peace would be an attempt to fight against nature—with the bloody results to our descendants which a hundred thousand years of peace-making upon the punitive model make altogether certain.

It would, however, be inexcusably sanguine to suppose that any distribution of territory or reframing of governments, no matter how just or how democratic, could in itself

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

insure peace in Eastern Europe. The racial lines are too intricate to be followed by any political boundaries. Do what we will to be fair to all concerned, there will still be split-off communities of one nationality embosomed within the territory of some alien race. Other causes of jealousy and enmity moreover will inevitably arise, new rivalry of interests combined with many ancient hatreds, so that the Greater Balkans if left to themselves will be ever on the very verge of war. They must not, then, be left to themselves. Peace forbids it. But Liberty equally forbids that they be swallowed again by some new paternal empire. Neither will it do to trust them to the benign management of a few Powers, delegated for that purpose by "Europe." That scheme has been tried long enough for us to estimate its value without further costly experimentation. The one plan which has not been tried is the one which alone on the face of it seems truly promising. That plan, of course, is that the nations of Eastern Europe should be prevented from breaking the world's peace by a league of all the world's nations, a league in which they themselves should have their rightful place, and one, therefore, which should represent them as well as all other peoples. Many of the causes of friction that have arisen in the Balkans or that are likely to arise in the Greater Balkans are of the kind that would plainly be justiciable before a neutral Court. Many others are of the sort that might be smoothed away by a neutral Council of Conciliation. And if it were known that the breaker of the peace would have to face not only some weak neighbor but the power of the whole League, and that no backing could be looked for from some friendly Great Power standing by and only too willing to sow discord in the Balkans for its own ends, there would be much less likelihood of war, and war if it should come would be far less dangerous to the world.

JAMES BISSETT PRATT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE

HOWELL CHENEY

To the general principle of health insurance, voluntarily conducted and established on a commercial basis, no one will take exception. We have come to look upon the health insurance of the people with small incomes as just as legitimate a part of their plan of life as either death or accident insurance or a credit or wage system. It is only when the idea of compulsion is applied to it that we have any serious cause for doubt. This is the starting point of all general objections.

It is acknowledged that the simplest forms of voluntary health insurance cost the average working man from two to three times per $100 of insurance what the same protection per $100 would cost in units of $10,000. It is primarily from this angle that a feeling of opposition to existing insurance arises in the workingman's mind. We are probably within the truth in stating that forty to fifty per cent of the premium is an inevitable and necessary carrying charge upon the business of commercially insuring under a voluntary plan great masses of laboring men for small amounts against disabilities arising out of sickness and death.

Our commercial organizations, further be it remembered, have only successfully tackled the problem of Group Insurance, or of insuring as an averaged unit a large number of individuals, as applicable to the hazard of death. In insurance against death they have succeeded in removing one of the insuperable obstacles of expense by treating great groups as units and by looking to the employer to pay the premium in one lump sum. Even here it is predicted that the experiment is doomed to disappointment, if not failure. It may be sound as an insurance proposition. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has not been tried on any considerable scale except where the employer has paid either the whole or a very large share of the premium and has practically given the insurance as a bonus, gift, or charity to his employees. The underlying motive has been the expectancy of attaching his employees to him by the prospect of reserves accumulating in proportion to the years of service. This motive may work as long as its application is exceptional with higher classes of employees, but has obviously a weakened power as it is generally adopted. It is at bottom a false motive and any employer who expects to solve his wage problems on the basis of either charity or gratitude has only himself to blame for the failure he is courting through dangerous temporizing.

While voluntary and mutual plans of sickness insurance can succeed within a certain field where either the employment policy or the social basis of selection gives a fair average risk, compulsion will automatically add four most important factors to this class of insurance. *First,* a true average of the risk. Under any voluntary plan there is an inevitably higher probability of securing a poorer average risk. *Second,* economy in administration through the forced collection of premiums at the source of the income, thus eliminating all expenses of agents and solicitation, and minimizing the expense of investigation and the payment of claims. *Third,* under a compulsory system a much higher degree of discipline can be enforced against doubtful claims, thus reducing malingering. Under a voluntary system it is almost impossible to enforce necessarily rigid rules for the protection of all where they happen to exclude individuals who have failed to comply with the requirements through carelessness or indifference. The necessary physical examinations for both membership and benefits are freed from many difficulties when they are enforced legally. *Fourth,* only full legal compulsion will remove the suspicion and distrust with which the majority of laboring men view any attempt of either employers or philanthropists or commercial agencies to promote an insurance of their disabilities.

Because we all of us accept the principle of insurance, practically without opposition today, we often do not stop to analyze the elementary character of the economic reserve that it gives us. The ordinary average working man

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is found to lose on an average of from seven to nine days a year from sickness. If he wishes to protect himself against half of the average loss of wages, he has to provide an insurance reserve of, say approximately, half of his wages for nine days, which will cost him from $10.00 to $15.00 in premiums a year. This is only true in the event that the loss is an average loss and covers not one individual, but groups of individuals large enough to secure an average loss. As an individual, if he wishes to give himself an equal protection, he has got to provide a fund which would give him half wages during disability, besides providing death benefits of half of one year's wages and medical attendance. It is estimated that the man who is earning $4.00 a day, if he is uninsured should have reserves behind him of approximately $1,500 to $2,000. As an individual, no smaller reserve will give him the same protection that premiums of from $10.00 to $15.00, distributed over the whole year, will guarantee. If the man has neither the individual surplus nor the insurance guaranteeing protection when adversity overtakes him, he and his dependents must immediately come down to a lower scale of living, and weakened by ill health he must again shoulder the problem of subsistence for himself and his family, not only with reduced physical strength, but with no material resources to fall back on. It is not surprising that he falls a prey to discontent on one hand and on the other gives himself up, either from ignorance or from superstition, to all sorts of fake remedies and quack doctors.

We have come to look upon insurance as a moral duty, which a man with very material resources behind him owes to his dependents to prevent their being thrown upon a lower scale of living when his immediate income stops. If they are subject to a moral obligation in order to prevent a break in the hopes and aspirations of their children, what is the condition of those to whom the sudden cutting off of support means not only the blotting out of hopes and aspirations, but perhaps of subsistence itself?

To the working man then, sickness insurance is not the luxury that it is to the man of higher income, which allows him to go about his work with a more comfortable feeling of mind that he has not got to pinch himself in any material comforts when some of the major hazards come upon him. To the working man without capital behind him, it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

means immediately tackling life from a lower plane with less physical strength and with less food, and hence, with less courage and with infinitely less chance of success. The possibility of creating the necessary reserves seems to inevitably and of necessity depend upon the compulsion that will automatically place this reserve behind him. It is well enough to assume that the working man ought to do it voluntarily. It is unquestionably proven that he will not do it voluntarily. Can he even be expected to do it voluntarily when it is acknowledged that the existing voluntary agencies are either wasteful in administration or unsound in principle? The only relief in sight which will practically work is to compel the deduction at its source of a percentage of wages sufficient to cover the average risk and to so safeguard the essential principles of insurance and the investment of these funds as to guarantee the relief in the hour of need.

The objection is raised that no automatic system can take the place of individual thrift; that the paternalistic or socialistic attempt to compel a man to do what he ought to do for himself is foredoomed to failure and makes for dependency and shiftlessness. Space does not permit of quarreling with the theory of this contention. We can only face the facts which are apparent to all—that the average working man who is earning less than $1,000 a year does not save and has no reserves behind him. We are all vitally interested in this fact and would like to mitigate it and explain it away if it were possible to do so. If you accept it as a fact, will you veto the application of a principle which you know to be sound in your own life, if this application can only be effectively and broadly secured by compulsion? Will you veto it if you realize that for small incomes especially the insurance principle has a far sounder economic basis than the pure savings idea? He who saves in order to meet a future disability must have a long time in which to do it and exercise great self-sacrifice in saving and skill in investing. He is finally the greater speculator in futures. To lay by, say $100, a year out of $1,000 he must have the ideal combination of four factors:—time, self-sacrifice, investing skill, and a justifiable spirit of adventure. And, if he dies at the end of one year, he leaves but $100, but if he insures he leaves his heirs $1,500. The saver is an isolated adventurer. He cares

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only for himself. The insurer is in strong contrast and rests himself upon the principle of combination and co-operation with all those who are exposed to the same average degree of risk. If this principle is sound for larger incomes, it is beyond dispute for those who are living close to the line of subsistence.

We must first, however, insist that in the enforcing of this principle under compulsion, we can only avoid unreasonable individual injustice if it is limited to groups who are subject to a similar degree of risk. As long as the hazards which are averaged are fairly within the common experience of all of the members of a group, there is no injustice in compelling contributions to a common fund. It is only when it is proven that "A," in contributing to relieving "B's" disabilities, is contributing to a far higher average of risk than he is himself subject to, that injustice occurs.

If we are willing to agree to the idea of compulsion, when limited to groups of a like average of risk, can we bring this compulsion into harmony with our social and legal philosophies?

If it is a part of our political, as well as our moral creed, that it is the duty of every individual to support himself; and if it is the duty of the state to protect itself as far as possible from dependency, why cannot the state compel the individual to actually perform what is recognized to be his universal obligation? We certainly are not willing to give up lightly the immense benefits and liberties that individualism has brought us. We believe in individualism and are going to continue to fight for it. Is it then a contradiction that we are willing to make some sacrifices to accomplish a higher degree of individual support on this earth, here and now? Shall we actually enforce the fundamental duty of self-support in the only practical way it can be accomplished, i. e., by the compulsory contribution to a common fund of all those who are subject to a like degree of economic risk, or shall we continue to attempt the impossible—the salvation of the derelicts of our individualism through the deadening influences of charity and poor relief?

Social workers and socialists exclaim with impatience against the restraints of constitutional limitations in working out social reform. It is confidently believed, however,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that we can find methods of working out this reform under constitutional methods and that in so working it out with strict regard to both individual rights and responsibilities, and under strict observance of sound and tried insurance principles, we will immensely increase its power for social upbuilding.

We would first lay it down as a fundamental and universal obligation of every man and woman of legal age, to provide during their working days for their own self-support during disability and temporary support for their dependents at their death. This is laid down not merely as a moral theory for general guidance, but as a fact of economic necessity, which the state is justified in enforcing. It is foreign to the method of development of the theory to insist that the state must do this to protect itself from dependency, but, if this theory gives the lawyer an added comfort, we need not object to it, unless it necessitates looking upon the exercise of this duty as an exercise of the police power, and the relief as poor relief and charity.

The method of enforcement should logically be through the imposition of an income insurance tax, pro-rated exactly upon the incomes of all classes of individuals within the state who were engaged in any form of labor for profit, i. e., upon all those who had any incomes, without respect to the character of their employment, but with certain obvious and reasonable exceptions, as the theory of the law permitted.

It is fundamental to the purpose in mind that both premiums and benefits be rigidly fixed in relation to income. So also must all individuals be classified according to those who are subject to a like degree of hazard. Only by observing these elementary principles of sound insurance can we guarantee that the compulsion does not bring about the taking of property inequitably from one class of individuals for the support of another class. Also, if we neglect these principles, we shall lose sight of the individual's rights and responsibilities upon which our foundations rest, and will forfeit one of the most valuable influences of such an undertaking—the safeguarding and protection of the health of groups so that the cost may be reduced or the benefits increased. So far the proposal has allowed for the greatest freedom of the individual in placing his insurance and has emphasized the necessity of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fulfilment of the individual's duties. The removal from any individual or class of an obligation, which clearly rests upon them, for the social betterment of another individual or class must inevitably fail of its purpose.

In the case of insurance, there can be no question but that a relation of dependency of the people upon the state will develop if the individual benefits derived are not purchased by proportionate individual sacrifices. If this is true as regards the receipt of benefits, it is more than true as regards the remedial and curative effects, which should be the most valuable factor to the state of such an insurance plan. Unless individual sacrifices will make for a reduction of the burden of the cost, there will be no incentives upon either individuals or groups to apply the preventive and protective measures which the modern conception of medicine has made available. The greatest benefit of the workmen's compensation law socially has not been in the benefits or compensation paid. It has been in the more direct incentive to prevent accidents, which has been a great economic saving, particularly among self-insurers. So in sickness, if the relation between the cost and its avoidance can be kept simple and direct, the incentives towards the scientific prevention of disease will be powerfully multiplied. We do not appreciate the amount of the cost at present. The first step is to visualize the cost by definitely locating it; the second is to establish more definitely the responsibility for its existence; the third is to apportion justly both the cost and profit for its reduction.

So far we have considered only the responsibility of the individual and the apportionment of the cost in relation to it. In doing this, we have attempted to present a method which is somewhat novel in the modern development of the subject, but which is in conformity with sound, economic and legal ideals.

May we now develop a theory to justify the placing of a part of the burden upon both employers and the state? Heretofore the employer's liability has been very vaguely based upon the theory of his responsibility for occupational diseases, but actually has been based upon the ease with which the tax could be collected from him. There was little justification for or thought of the establishing of an exact relationship between diseases and the conditions of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

employment. Probably the amount of disease attributable to employment, in the sense that it is either preventable by the employer or is in excess of the best obtainable standards ruling in any employments, is relatively small. Is not the fact apparent that the great bulk of sickness does not arise out of the conditions of employment, but does arise either out of our personal indulgences and abuses, or out of our relations with each other as citizens or members of a community?

The basis of the employers' and the State's contributions should be justified on some calculable theory of their responsibility for causes. Too exact and rigid a justification in each case need not be insisted upon, and it seems perfectly possible that the statute might establish rules of presumptions of accountability that could only be offset by reasonable proof to the contrary, as well as rules of specific accountability for certain diseases.

Diseases and injuries not covered by existing compensation laws may be attributable to three general sources. *First,* to personal indulgences, abuses, strains or infections arising out of the voluntary acts of individuals or their guardians, other than their choices of employments or habitations. *Second,* to occupational poisons, irritants, strains and infections when resulting from specific conditions of employment. *Third,* to infections and injuries arising out of our social and community environment, not due to employment.

The greater amount of our disabilities is fairly traceable to the person suffering them. The statute might specifically state that the presumption in the following cases was that they were attributable to the individual and that this presumption could only be offset by reasonable proof to the contrary. Under this class would come all petty complaints which are fairly attributable to the direct and personal neglect of the primary laws of hygiene; diseases resulting from congenital, organic or hereditary causes; all disabilities directly traceable to the effects of alcohol, drugs and narcotics; sexual diseases and diseases peculiar to sex and the genito urinary organs; organic mental disorders and diseases of the brain; all accidental injuries, not received in the course of employment, and for which there exists no legal liability to pay damages.

Diseases which might be attributable to the State and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

charged directly to the State fund are those contagious diseases, against which legal quarantines are, or can be, established over individuals; and infectious diseases, which, it is fair to assume, State supervision through an enforcement of the police powers of the State, as directed by modern science, might control, if not entirely eliminate. Where a past history exists to account directly for the infection, the responsibility might be divided, either between the State and the individual, or the State and the employer.

The diseases attributable to the occupation would include all occupational poisoning cases; the diseases contracted in caisson or under high air pressure; and all diseases due to physical strains and diseases of the nerves, which could be traceable predominatingly to employment.

There remains an indefinite field, which would tend to become constantly narrower, in which there would be no presumption and in which the responsibility might be divided. This would include a division of the responsibility for nervous diseases and for the more common communicable diseases. If the individual, previous to employment, had a history that would account for the existence of these diseases, as is usual in a great majority of cases, they could not be fairly charged to the employment or the State, though they might be aggravated by employment or public sanitary conditions. No investigations could arrive at exact proportions of responsibility in each case, but they could arrive at approximations or averages which would work for a pretty exact measure of justice as a whole.

The point to insist upon is that, unless we get some fairly approximate apportionment of the responsibility, we shall not work for the elimination of the causes and shall fail, as has been pointed out, of the highest purpose we are pursuing.

HOWELL CHENEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STRATEGY ON THE WESTERN FRONT—III

BY LIEUTENANT COLONEL H. H. SARGENT, U. S. ARMY RETIRED

GERMANY'S THIRD GREAT MISTAKE

Since the great attempt to break through the Western front at Verdun had utterly failed and Germany saw there was no longer any hope of doing it and resuming a war of movement, she again reverted to her former plan to hold it defensively with a sufficient force to prevent the Allies from breaking through, and with her available forces took the offensive successfully against Russia, Roumania, Italy, and again against Russia; and, largely as a result of carrying out this plan, was wholly or partly successful against each. Had she continued in this way to mass her forces in turn against the Allied armies at Salonika and in Italy, she would most probably, with considerably less effort than she later spent in attempting to break through on the Western front, have conquered or annihilated or captured both.

With the Salonika army defeated, the German and Austrian armies could have quickly overrun and occupied Greece; and with the Italian army defeated, they could have occupied the valley of the Po, rich in agriculture and manufactories, and have pushed forward to the French and Maritime Alps; and might have been able to break through the Maritime Alps and invade France via Nice. And even had Germany been stopped there, she could easily have held temporarily the line of the French Alps, and thence southward to the sea, as well as the line of the Western front, while she was organizing and bringing into her system all the conquered countries. Master of Italy, Greece, Albania, Montenegro, Serbia, Roumania, Bulgaria, Austria, Russia, and the greater part of Turkey, her dominion would have been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mightier than was that of Napoleon at the height of his power.

Having reached such success as here set forth, she would have been in a position to forestall the landing of any expedition in the Balkans from the Aegean Sea, in Austria from the Adriatic, or in Turkey from the Eastern Mediterranean; or, had it been landed, would have been favorably situated militarily for concentrating a greatly superior force against it; and destroying it before it could have gained a foothold and advanced into the interior.

For some reason Germany did not continue to carry out this plan; but decided to renew the offensive on the Western front; and with this end in view began on March 21, 1918, a little more than two years from the time of beginning the attack on Verdun, a powerful attack against the Allied line opposite Amiens, and then followed it up by a like attack against the British line in the vicinity of Ypres, and two other similar attacks against the French line between Reims and Montdidier, towards Chateau-Thierry. By massing overwhelming forces against sectors of the line in these attacks, Germany succeeded in pushing it back thirty-five miles opposite Amiens, thirty miles to Chateau-Thierry, and about ten miles in the vicinity of Ypres; but in no case was she able to break completely through the line and resume a war of movement.

Just why Germany made such a complete and momentous change in her whole strategical plan[1] in March, 1918, is not now fully known; but the principal reasons for the change are probably as follows:

First: Because she felt that she must make a supreme effort for victory on the Western front before the American troops arrived there in large numbers.

Second: Because the German commanders, having discovered that the British had built very few if any lines of entrenchments behind certain sectors of their line, and had very few reserves behind them, hoped by attacking these weak sectors with greatly superior forces, which had become available as a result of the collapse and disintegration of the Russian armies, to be able to break through them and resume a war of movement.

Third: Because the military authorities, by a study of

[1] There was a persistent rumor at the time that Hindenburg was opposed to this change of plan which the German General Staff approved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General von Hutier's plan of attacking, based upon his experience in the capture of Riga, and their easy success in driving back the British troops after the British victory at Cambrai, had become convinced that the best way to break through an entrenched line was not to pound themselves forward by a succession of small attacks, as they had attempted to do at Verdun, and as the British had done at the Somme, but to assemble their divisions in overwhelming force against a long sector of the enemy's line and gathering up all their implements and methods of destruction, to move forward on an extended front and strike it with their utmost power.

Since the strategical situation on the Western front during this time had not changed, the question arises: Why did not Germany make the second effort to break the Allied front along the Verdun-Reims sector, instead of making it along the Somme sector from La Fere to Arras? The answer is, that although strategically the Verdun-Reims sector was the better place to break through, tactically it was the more difficult. Bitter experience had already taught Germany that it would be impossible to break through this sector of the line. Then, again, Germany must have known that a large portion of the French reserves were at this time in Champagne south of Reims and that very few, if any, were in rear of the Somme sector. And she doubtless knew, too, that the British had constructed few, if any, lines of intrenchments behind this sector after the battle of the Somme; and that she had taken over only recently that portion of the sector south of St. Quentin; and, as yet, had not had time to make complete arrangements for holding it. Then, too, the Germans knew that the dividing line separating the French from the British armies crossed this sector at its southern end; and that there was as yet no commander in chief of the Allied armies on the Western front, each army having thus far in the war acted to a great extent independently; which facts could not but be bound to prevent that full unity of command between them, so essential to success. All of which no doubt led the Germans to choose this sector for their great attack.

Their plan evidently was to throw an enormous force against this fifty miles of British front and to open a gap between the British and French armies, forcing, if possible, the British back on the English Channel and the French

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

back upon Paris; then to contain one while they settled with the other.

As to whether, if successful, they would have first proceeded against the British and attempted to throw them back on the Channel ports and captured them; or against the French and attempted to envelop, defeat, and capture them and the French capital, is not now known; and, perhaps, was not known by them at the time; for they may have intended awaiting future developments before making a decision.

But it may be remarked here that it probably would have been better for the Germans to settle with the British first; since to proceed against the French about Paris while this large British army was in their rear and threatening their lines of communication back through France and Belgium would have been highly dangerous.

Although the great attack begun by the Germans on March 21, 1918, failed to separate the British from the French armies, it forced the Allied line back a distance of about thirty-five miles, producing an immense salient opposite Amiens whose base was about fifty miles in extent; and it had the immediate effect also of changing the slightly curved front between Verdun and the English Channel into an angular front which extended from Verdun in a generally western direction past Noyon to a point about one mile south of Montdidier and thence in a generally northern direction to Nieuport on the English Channel. This change from a curved to an angular front, as well as the creation of the salient opposite Amiens, not only made a vast difference in the strategical situation of the combatant armies, but it had the immediate effect of bringing about greater unity of action between the Allies, by causing them to select General Ferdinand Foch as Commander-in-Chief. It is purposed to discuss in this and an article in the next issue of THE REVIEW, each of these changes under the headings: An Angular Front; A Salient; and Unity of Command.

AN ANGULAR FRONT

Occupying that portion of the theater of war within the angular front, the Germans had the advantage of interior lines, which enabled them to mass a superior force upon either the western or southern portion of their front much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more quickly and easily than could the Allies on the outside of the angular front assemble a sufficient force to meet it.

But, on the other hand, this angular front gave to the Allies a great strategical advantage, in that, if they should break through on either front it would so threaten the communications of the Germans attacking on the other as to compel them to turn back to save their communications. In other words, it gave the Allies the opportunity of carrying out that great principle of strategy of striking at their adversary's communications without exposing their own; for it mattered not whether they should strike northward from the Reims-Verdun front toward Mezieres and Sedan or eastward from the Amiens-Arras-Lens front toward Hirson and Maubeuge, in either case they would sever a considerable number of the German lines of communication and threaten seriously the remainder without in the least exposing their own to a German attack.

And this advantage which the Allies possessed, had they had the strength or genius to make use of it, far surpassed the advantage which the Germans possessed as a result of their central position and interior lines. And the reason for this is that an attack made directly through the lines upon the German communications would not only have effectually put a stop at once to their advance, but would have placed them in a most precarious situation and compelled them to turn back to fight for the recovery of their lost or threatened communications.

To illustrate: Suppose that at the time the Germans began their great attack of March 21, or a day or two afterwards, the French with their reserves massed in Champagne had been prepared to make a great attack northward from the Reims-Verdun front and had broken through a considerable distance, very much as the Germans broke through in their great push toward Amiens, and had cut the east and west railways south of the Ardennes Mountains, what would have been the result? The answer is, that the Germans would have been compelled to stop their advance, turn back, and either fight to recover the lost railways or try to escape from the pocket in which this maneuver had placed them, by retreating northeastward and gaining the Charleroi-Namur-Liege-Aix-la-Chapelle railway.

If to this the reply be made that the Argonne forest,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

just north of the Reims-Verdun front, was such a difficult country to operate in, and so strongly fortified and held, that little headway could have been made through it, the answer is that the Americans afterwards forced themselves through it in the face of a most desperate resistance; and that a powerful attack on this vital part of the angular front, even if it had not made much headway, would nevertheless have compelled the Germans to halt their leading divisions and send back many of them to stop the French advance, just as a few months later they were forced to send them back to try to stop the onrush of the American soldiers.

The maxim or principle of war which applies in these cases is, that where two armies are maneuvering against each other's communications, or are attacking each other, that army whose communications are the more seriously threatened will invariably abandon any effort to press on and will fall back to fight for its communications. And "The importance of this fact," says Hamley, "is immense; for the commander who finds himself on his enemy's rear, while his own is still beyond his adversary's reach, may cast aside all anxiety for his own communications, and call up every detachment to the decisive point, certain that the enemy will abandon his own designs in order, if possible, to retrieve his position."[1]

There are, it is believed, no exceptions in history to this maxim, save in a few cases where the commanding general had decided to give up his communications because he had established, or planned to establish, new ones; as Napoleon did at Austerlitz,[2] where he made no effort to fight to preserve his threatened communications back southward through Vienna, because he had already prepared new ones westward through Bohemia, which he could have used in case of defeat; or as Sherman did in the Atlanta campaign, where he made no effort to fight for his communications back to Chattanooga, upon Hood's marching rearward from Sherman's front to cut them, because he had decided to cut loose from them and march to the sea, where he would establish, and did establish, a new base for future operations.

It would appear that had the Allies been in a condition to strike at the communications of the Germans by breaking through the line on one side or the other of the angular

[1] Hamley, *Operations of War*, p. 93.
[2] Sargent, *Napoleon Bonaparte's First Campaign*, pp. 186 and 187.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

front, there was offered them strategically a most favorable opportunity for its success, since the Germans in their great attacks invariably selected the front behind which there were few Allied reserves for massing their own reserves preparatory to making the attempt to break through, thus necessarily weakening proportionately their own front behind which the Allied reserves were massed, and thereby making it the very front on which an Allied offensive would most probably succeed.

But, as a matter of fact, nothing of this kind was attempted. On the contrary, when the Germans made their attack on March 21, 1918, the Allied reserves in Champagne, and such other reserves as could be collected, were hurried around the angular front with all possible speed to stop the German advance on Amiens; then when the Germans made their second great attack south of Ypres on April 9, the reserves were hurried northward to that point to help save the British, who in a critical situation with "their backs to the wall" were fighting desperately to keep themselves from being driven into the sea; then when the Germans made their third great attack on May 27, upon Chateau-Thierry, and for the second time in the war reached the Marne, the reserves were hurriedly sent to that front to check the Germans and keep them from cutting off the French right wing and from finally reaching Paris.

Why were all the Allied efforts to stop the Germans during these four months, from March 21 until July 18 when Foch began his great offensive, confined entirely to defensive operations? Until fuller details of the situation become known this question cannot be satisfactorily answered; but probably the failure of the Allies to appoint a commander-in-chief prior to the great German offensive of March 21 had much to do with it; for it must be remembered that it takes time to prepare for an offensive, and that "the transition from the defensive to the offensive is," according to Napoleon, "one of the most delicate operations of war."[1] Of course the aim of the Allies during these four critical months was to hold the Germans until America could transport sufficient men to France to give the Allies a preponderance of fighting troops. But whether this purely defensive strategy, which seems to have been the Allied plan up to the counter-attack begun by General Foch on

[1] General Bournod, *Napoleon's Maxims of War*, p. 50.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

July 18, was as effective in gaining the result sought as defensive-offensive strategy would have been is questionable.

As to waiting for prepondering forces before beginning an offensive, there is this to be said in its favor: since the Americans were sending to France on an average of more than 200,000 soldiers a month the Allies would soon considerably outnumber the Germans. But did this justify their waiting during these critical months for preponderating forces? Perhaps so! At any rate, it succeeded. Nevertheless, it is well to remember that great soldiers have seldom deemed it necessary, even in critical times, to wait for preponderating forces before undertaking offensive operations; and that, not infrequently, such operations have led to the greatest victories. A vastly preponderating force against Robert E. Lee did not prevent him and his great lieutenant, "Stonewall" Jackson, from winning the battle of Chancellorsville; nor did it prevent Bonaparte in his first Italian campaign, although greatly outnumbered at all times in the theater of war, from bringing a superior force upon practically every battlefield; and by so doing defeating and crushing one Sardinian and six Austrian armies sent successively against him.[1]

But until the facts are more fully known it is not safe to pronounce definite criticism on any of the operations of the Allies during these four critical months. Nevertheless, from what is known, and judging from the strategical ability shown by Marshal Foch in his subsequent operations on the Western front as commander-in-chief, we are of the opinion that, had he been appointed commander-in-chief of the Allied armies a sufficient time prior to the great thrust toward Amiens, begun on March 21, 1918, to have formulated and worked out his plans for meeting the attacks, he would have put a stop to them much earlier than he did.

(*To be continued.*)

[1] Sargent, *Napoleon Bonaparte's First Campaign*, pp. 168 and 169.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RAILWAY PROBLEM—II[1]

BY VICTOR MORAWETZ

If permitted by law to increase their rates the railway companies could earn large returns for their stockholders; for the industries and commerce of the country could not exist without the railways. It is true also that the earnings of most of the railway companies prior to our entry into the war would have been adequate to sustain their credit if the stability of these earnings had been assured. It seems evident, therefore, that the failure of the credit of the railway companies has been due to the fact that investors have lost confidence in the wisdom and fairness of the rate-regulating commissions established by the National and State governments. Investors have reached the conclusion that in the long run the companies will not be allowed to charge the rates necessary to enable them to earn adequate returns upon their stocks and bonds, except bonds of the safest class. Confidence in railway investments can be restored only by furnishing to investors some irrevocable governmental promise or assurance of a definite and certain return on their investments.

Although such a promise or assurance of the Government commonly is called a "guaranty," it must be understood that it is not a guaranty in any strict sense. The word "guaranty" implies an assumption of responsibility for the acts of others; but in giving the promise or assurance under consideration the Government would assume no responsibility for any acts except its own. In substance and effect, the Government merely would undertake not to exercise its power to regulate railway rates in such manner as to deprive the owners of railroad securities of certain minimum returns on their investments, the sums thus assured to in-

[1] The concluding portion of the Morawetz Plan, the first part of which was printed in the March REVIEW, will be found on pages 514 to 520 of the present issue.—EDITOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vestors being less than the returns which they have a constitutional and moral right to claim. Such an undertaking would not really impose a new obligation on the Government. The so-called "guaranty" of the Government would be a guaranty against its own wrongful acts.

As pointed out in my article published in the March number of the REVIEW, legislation directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to apply new formulas in fixing rates or directing the Commission to fix rates that will yield some specified return on the capital of the companies would fail in the long run to restore the credit of the companies, *first,* because such legislation could be altered, amended or repealed at any time, and *secondly,* because of the difficulty of enforcing it. If such legislation could be depended upon as a permanent protection to investors, it would amount to a promise or guaranty by the Government that rates shall always be kept high enough to furnish the railway companies with certain prescribed incomes.

A sounder and better plan is to restore confidence in railway bonds and stocks by utilizing the high credit of the Government in the form of a definite and irrevocable promise or guaranty of interest on the bonds and of minimum dividends on the stocks. If the railway companies were enabled by means of such governmental promise or guaranty to raise needed capital upon favorable terms, the saving thus effected should accrue to the people through a lowering of transportation rates, or through participation of the Government in the earnings of the Companies.

In the plan submitted by me it is proposed, tentatively, that the aggregate amount guaranteed by the Government at the outset shall be approximately 65 per cent of the amount now payable by the Government under the Federal Control Act on account of the average operating income of the railways during the three test years specified in the Act, and that the Government shall guarantee the interest on the bonds and minimum dividends on the stock thereafter issued with the approval of the Government for additions and improvements. It is proposed that in determining the operating income upon which the guaranty is to be based all attending circumstances shall be taken into consideration and that all proper adjustments shall be made. Thus, if during any part of the test years a railway was in the hands of a receiver or made capital expenditures not reflected in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its earnings, these facts should be taken into consideration. Special allowances or arbitraries should be given to short lines contributing long-haul business to through lines and due allowance should also be made for the prospective increase of the business and earnings of lines located in undeveloped sections of the country.

It has been urged that the amount guaranteed by the Government under this plan would be too low and that rates probably would be kept down to a level that would not permit the companies to earn more than the amount guaranteed by the Government. The proposal of an initial guaranty amounting to 65 per cent of the operating income of the test years was made merely for purposes of illustration, and it is probable that a higher per cent—possibly 75 per cent—should be adopted. However, it is important that the stockholders of the railway companies shall retain a substantial contingent interest in the future results of the management of their companies. The higher the governmental guaranty, the less interest would the stockholders have in the management of their companies and the nearer would we come to governmental ownership. The most desirable course would be to have the guaranty of the Government large enough to make railway securities attractive to investors, but to leave a substantial part of the return to the stockholders dependent upon efficient management of their companies. The stockholders of the companies certainly cannot complain if the Government by its guaranty furnishes them with the credit needed for their future capital requirements, while leaving unimpaired their present constitutional right to earn a fair return on their property.

Consolidation of the Companies

No plan for the solution of the problem can be successful without providing for the consolidation of the railway companies into a comparatively small number of large, well-balanced railway systems, each built up around one of the existing great systems as a nucleus. A consolidation involves an exchange of the stocks of the several constituent companies, and in some cases an exchange of their bonds, for stock or bonds of the new company to be formed by the consolidation. It is necessary, therefore, in every plan or agreement of consolidation to fix (1) the aggregate amount of stock and bonds to be issued by the consolidated com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pany for the properties vested in it through the consolidation, and (2) the portion of the stock and bonds of the consolidated company to be given to each class of bondholders and stockholders of the several constituent companies.

Such an exchange of stocks and bonds would, of necessity, require much labor and expense, even though many issues of safe bonds may be left undisturbed; but it is difficult to see how this can be avoided under any satisfactory plan. The aggregate interest charges of the companies should be reduced to an amount substantially less than the aggregate amount of the Government's guaranty, so that a portion of the guaranty may inure to the benefit of the stockholders. Moreover, companies which accept the plan and obtain the benefit of the governmental guaranty should be required to consolidate upon some prescribed terms with other companies that ought to be included in the same system. To extend the guaranty of the Government to each of the existing companies separately without a change of its capitalization and without providing some definite basis for the consolidation of the companies would not solve the problem.

The fairest and most practical plan appears to be to fix the capitalization of the companies, the apportionment of securities upon a consolidation and the amount of the governmental guaranty all on the basis of the average operating incomes of the companies during the test years, adjusted as above provided. As these operating incomes were the result of rates fixed by the Federal and State commissions during a period in which the companies did not enjoy more than average prosperity, it may fairly be assumed that these operating incomes were not unduly large.

It has been proposed that 40 per cent of this average annual operating income shall be capitalized on a 4 per cent basis by the issue of guaranteed 4 per cent bonds, and that the remaining 60 per cent shall be capitalized by the issue of shares of stock upon which this operating income would suffice to pay $6 per share in dividends, the Government guaranteeing $2.50 per share. The result would be an issue of 4 per cent bonds to an aggregate amount at par equal to ten times the average annual operating income and the issue of a like amount of stock assuming the shares to be a par value of $100 each. According to my proposal, the shares thus issued are to have no nominal or par value. If,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

however, it should be found necessary to give the shares a nominal or par value, and if in the opinion of Congress a nominal or par value of $100 per share would make the aggregate par amount of the stock too large, the amount could be reduced to any desired sum by making the par amount of each share less than $100. It should be understood, however, that the number of shares should not be diminished and that the reduction of their par amount should not affect the guaranty of $2.50 in dividends on each share and the right of the Government to share with the stockholders in any distribution of earnings in excess of $4 per share.

A physical valuation of the railways may be of service in determining the amount of operating income of which the railway companies cannot constitutionally be deprived by governmental regulation, but there is no good reason for limiting the aggregate par amount of stock and bonds to be issued upon a consolidation to the original cost, or cost of reproduction, of the properties vested in the consolidated company. The rates which a company is allowed by law to charge, or which it is able to charge, are not affected by the nominal or par amount of the stock and bonds which the company has outstanding. Neither the rates chargeable by a company nor the substantial rights of the stockholders or of the public are affected by the nominal or par value of a company's stock, and it is not important whether the par value of shares be fixed at $100 or at $50, or at nothing, as is now common practice in forming industrial companies under the laws of some of the States.

Certainly, a physical valuation would furnish no just basis for the apportionment of the stock and bonds of a consolidated company among the stockholders and bondholders of its constituent companies. The value of the stock of a company does not depend upon the original cost of its property or the cost of reproducing it, but upon the amount of the operating income which the company can earn and apply to the payment of dividends on the stock. Upon a consolidation of companies the only fair course is to apportion the securities of the consolidated company among the security holders of the constituent companies according to the estimated operating income which these companies severally will contribute to the combined company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A statutory valuation of the railways has been in progress since the year 1914 at enormous cost to the Government and to the railway companies, but the valuation of only a few of the smaller lines has been completed. Probably it will take more than five years more to complete the valuation of all the lines, and probably additional years will be consumed in controversies and litigation to correct errors in the official valuations. When completed, these valuations will be of little service as they will be based on the prices of previous years. It seems obvious, therefore, that no plan based upon an official valuation of the properties of the railway companies can be carried out within any reasonable time.

The official valuation of the railways should be completed—not for the purpose of providing a basis for the recapitalization of their companies, nor for the purpose of providing a basis for the consolidation—the companies—but for the purpose of assisting the governmental authorities and the courts in determining the amount of income which the companies thereafter will have a constitutional right to earn over and above the sums guaranteed by the Government.

Limitation of State Regulation

At the present time the corporate powers of the railway companies are governed by the varying laws of the different States, and each State exercises an independent power to regulate the railways within its territory and to fix intrastate rates, while the Federal Government undertakes to regulate the interstate transportation and interstate rates of all the companies. The resulting multiple and often conflicting regulation renders impossible the adoption of any wise or consistent policy of regulation or of rate-fixing and is injurious both to the railway companies and to the people of all the States. No satisfactory or permanent solution of the railway problem is practicable without providing for the incorporation of the railway companies under Federal laws, or without centralizing supreme control over their regulation in some agency of the Federal Government.

Adequate provision should, however, be made for the protection of local interests. The power of each State to tax the railways within its borders should be preserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the police powers of the States should not be interfered with to a greater extent than is necessary. In these respects the railways should be placed substantially upon the same footing as the National banks.

While supreme control over intrastate as well as interstate rates must be vested in some commission or board established by the Federal Government, provision should be made for the protection of the interests of the several States and localities by the appointment of regional boards with jurisdiction over matters of local interest. A majority of the members of each of these regional boards should be residents of the State or States in which it has jurisdiction. Each State commission should continue to exercise its power to investigate the practices of the railway companies within the State and should have the right to represent the interests of the State in all matters before the Federal commissions or boards.

Methods of Federal Control

Whatever plan may be adopted, it is certain that the control over the railways exercised by the Federal Government prior to the war will be largely extended by Congress upon the termination of Federal control. The duties and functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission have grown to be so complex and burdensome that no single commission possibly could perform them in a satisfactory manner. With a further extension of Federal control over the railways the need of relieving the Interstate Commerce Commission of some of its duties and functions will become imperative.

A satisfactory plan for the solution of the problem, therefore, must provide new and improved machinery for exercising the regulatory powers vested in the Federal Government. The power to regulate the rates and practices of the companies and to deal with matters of an administrative character should be vested in a central board with numerous branches or regional boards subject to its supervision and control. Supreme control over the whole system of regulation, including the power to hear appeals from the decisions of the central board having immediate control over the rates and practices of the companies should be vested in a Federal Railway Board similar in its constitution to the Federal Reserve Board. The duty of in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vestigating and prosecuting violations of law or of regulations should be in charge of the legal department of the Governmen

The Federal Railway Board should be appointed by the President with the advice or approval of the Senate; but, in order that the whole system of regulation may, so far as is possible, be kept free from politics, it is desirable that the members of the central board and of the regional boards of regulation shall be appointed by the Federal Railway Board.

No plan can succeed unless its execution is placed in the hands of men of proven ability and character. In view of the vital importance of the subject, it is not unreasonable to expect that in the appointment of the Board or Commission which will exercise supreme control over the railways of the country, the President and Senate will brush aside arguments of political expediency and will consider only the welfare of the country.

VICTOR MORAWETZ.

THE MORAWETZ PLAN

(*Continued from the March issue of the* REVIEW.)

It is further suggested tentatively that for each railway property vested in a Federal corporation there be issued

(a) 4 per cent debentures of the Federal corporation, guaranteed by the Government, to an aggregate amount that would impose an interest charge equal to forty per cent of the estimated operating income of the property, and

(b) shares of stock to an amount upon which the remaining sixty per cent of the operating income would suffice to pay $6 per share, the Government to guarantee payment of $2.50 per share; any distribution of income in excess of $4 per share to be divided between the Government and the shareholders and the Government to have an option to purchase the stock at any time at $85 per share.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On this basis the Government would guarantee in the aggregate only 65 per cent. of the operating income which the railways would be entitled to earn under a fair and constitutional exercise of the Governmental power to regulate their rates. In consideration of this guarantee it is proposed to give to the Government (1) a share in any distribution of income in excess of four per cent. on the stock of the Federal corporation, (2) ample power to control the management of the railways free from interference by the courts, and (3) an option to acquire the railways at a fair cost without condemnation proceedings, if hereafter it should be found desirable to establish direct Governmental ownership and operation.

The distribution among the stockholders and bondholders of each existing railway company of the aggregate amounts of debentures and stock of the Federal corporation to be issued in exchange for the company's property would have to be adjusted by agreement of the parties as in ordinary reorganizations. It is, therefore, suggested that the Federal Railway Board to be established under the plan should have full power to negotiate with the directors of each company and with committees of security holders.

It is believed that the great bulk of the stockholders and bondholders of the companies would soon agree to any fair terms offered them. Unanimous agreement of the bondholders and stockholders would not be necessary. A majority of the stockholders of some of the companies have now the power to sell the property of their company subject to its indebtedness, and in other cases legislation probably could be obtained giving such power to the majority. But, if in any case the stockholders are unwilling to agree to reasonable terms their equity could be acquired through a condemnation proceeding.

In most cases it would be safe to proceed upon obtaining the assent of the holders of a majority of the junior issues of bonds of a company. The outstanding bonds would not be assumed by the Federal corporation, and the bonds received from assenting bondholders would be kept alive in the treasury of the Federal corporation, so that the security of the non-assenting bondholders would not be improved. Separate accounts should be kept of a railway thus acquired subject to outstanding bonded indebtedness,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and if the property should not earn the interest on all outstanding bonds, including those in the treasury of the Federal corporation, the latter could foreclose the mortgage securing the bonds held in its treasury, in which event the property could be bought in by the Federal corporation by paying to the non-assenting bondholders only their proportional share of the net proceeds of the foreclosure sale.

It is proposed that the management of the Federal corporations owning and operating the railways shall be shared by the Government and by the stockholders of the corporations, as in case of the Federal reserve banks, and that the consummation of the plan as well as the future management of the Federal corporations be placed under the control and supervision of a Federal Railway Board similar in its constitution to the Federal Reserve Board.

An Act of Congress to be passed conferring all powers required to carry out the following plan.

1. A Federal Railway Board to be created with supreme power of regulation and control over the Federal railway companies to be formed as herein provided. This Federal Railway Board should be a body of the highest dignity. A member of the President's cabinet should be a member, and its other members should be selected with the greatest care by the President with the advice and approval of the Senate.

2. The Federal Railway Board to organize ten to fifteen Federal railway companies under the Act of Congress. Each of these companies to have the usual powers of railway companies and also power, with the approval of the Federal Railway Board, to acquire all or any existing lines of railway. In carrying out the plan the existing lines to be consolidated in the Federal corporations as directed by the Federal Railway Board in such manner as to make ten to fifteen well balanced railway systems.

Provision to be made for the issue by each Federal corporation of debentures and stock in amounts sufficient to take up as hereinafter provided the bonds and stocks of the existing companies whose properties are to be vested in such Federal corporations and also to provide for future capital requirements. The stocks of the Federal corporations to have no nominal or par value. Payment of the principal and interest of the debentures issued by the Federal corporations and payment of fixed minimum dividends

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(say $2.50 per share) on their stocks to be guaranteed by the United States.

Upon any distribution of net income of a Federal corporation in excess of a minimum dividend on its stock (say $4 per share per annum, non-cumulative) the excess to be divided between the Government and the stockholders of the corporation in prescribed proportions.

3. A specified number of the directors of each Federal corporation to be appointed by the Federal Railway Board and the remainder to be elected by the stockholders of the corporation. The president and executive officers of each Federal corporation to be chosen by its board of directors, but all directors and officers to be subject to removal by the Federal Railway Board. Salaries of officers to be subject to approval by the Federal Railway Board, but the board of directors of each company to have power to pay additional compensation to executive officers out of moneys which otherwise would be payable to the stockholders as dividends. The directors to be paid salaries approved by the Federal Railway Board, subject to a deduction for every meeting which they fail to attend.

4. The Federal Railway Board to have plenary and exclusive power of regulation of the Federal corporations, including power to require them to make any operating arrangements deemed desirable in the interests of the whole country.

The Federal Railway Board to appoint *regional* boards of regulation and one *central* board of regulation. A majority of the members of each regional board to be appointed from persons resident in the region in which the board sits. Each regional board to have power to take up any regional matters, including rate questions, at its own initiative, or when directed by the central board of regulation; but no regulation by a regional board to take effect until approved by the central board of regulation. (The latter requirement is deemed necessary to secure harmony and is essential to the proper regulation of rates.)

The *central* board of regulation to deal primarily with all through rates and matters affecting all regions of the country. Questions relating to local rates and strictly regional matters to be referred to the regional boards, subject, however, to the supervision of the central board.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All acts and decisions of the central board as well as of the regional boards of regulation to be subject to the supreme authority of the Federal Railway Board.

Power to be vested in the Federal Railway Board, through the central and regional boards of regulation, (subject to the necessary constitutional limitations) to regulate *all* rates of existing railway companies as well as those of the Federal corporations and to execute all the powers now vested in the Interstate Commerce Commission; but, except as to rates and as to other matters of which the Interstate Commerce Commission now has exclusive jurisdiction, the existing companies to remain subject to regulation by the several States.

5. The Act of Congress to provide that each Federal corporation shall pay in each State taxes on the proportion of its property located within the State. The basis for fixing the aggregate value of the taxable property of each corporation and for the apportionment thereof among the States to be prescribed by the Act of Congress and all questions of taxation to be decided in the first instance by the Federal Railway Board subject to an appeal to the Supreme Court.

The police powers of the several States in relation to the Federal corporations, their officials and their property to be left unabridged, except when in conflict with the Act of Congress or with regulations of the Federal Railway Board.

6. Issues of debentures and stock of the Federal corporations to be made only as authorized by the Federal Railway Board and for purposes approved by it. Debentures and stock to be issued as hereinafter provided to take over existing lines when authorized by the Federal Railway Board. Additional debentures and stock for new construction, betterments and additions to be issued only up to aggregate amounts authorized from time to time by Act of Congress and each sale to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

7. The accounts of each Federal corporation to be kept according to the best methods of accounting as prescribed by the Federal Railway Board and detailed annual reports to be published.

8. The Federal Railway Board to have power to negotiate with the representatives of each railway company

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and with committees of its bondholders and stockholders for a transfer of the property of their company to a designated Federal corporation and for an exchange of their bonds and stocks for debentures and stock of the Federal corporation.

The aggregate amount of debentures and stock of a Federal corporation to be issued for each property not to exceed an amount fixed as provided in paragraph 14 introductory to this plan on the basis of the estimated prospective true operating income of the property, so that the amount of interest and dividends guaranteed by the Government shall in no case exceed sixty-five per cent. of the estimated operating income of the property and that the interest on the debentures shall not exceed forty per cent. of this operating income. It is suggested tentatively that the debentures of the Federal corporation be made payable in sixty years and redeemable after forty years.

For example, if the true operating income of a railway company is $6,000,000 per annum, the aggregate amount of debentures and stock of the Federal corporation to be issued for the company's property would be as follows:

(a) $60,000,000 of guaranteed 4 per cent. debentures, upon which the annual interest charge would be.....	$2,400,000
(b) 600,000 shares of stock (without par value) upon which $6 per share would be earned and the Government would guarantee $2.50 or.....	1,500,000
Total Government guaranty.....	$3,900,000

The Government to have an optional right to purchase the stock at any time at $85 per share.

As expenditures for unprofitable improvements, etc., would be deducted from the operating income shown under the rules of the Interstate Commerce Commission in determining the true operating income for the purposes of this plan, the whole amount thereof could properly be distributed. Assuming that the operating income in excess of dividends of $4 per share on the stock is to be divided between the stockholders and the Government, the $6,000,000 of operating income would be applied as follows:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Interest on $60,000,000 debentures.....	$2,400,000
Dividend on 600,000 shares at $4 per share	2,400,000
Balance to be divided between the Government and the stockholders.....	1,200,000
Total	$6,000,000

A railway to be acquired only if an amount of outstanding bonds satisfactory to the Federal Railway Board shall be deposited for exchange into the debentures and stock of the Federal corporation. Until bonds held by non-assenting bondholders are exchanged or paid off, an amount of debentures creating the same aggregate interest charge as the outstanding bonds to be reserved by the Federal corporation out of the aggregate amount to be issued by it for the property. Bonds of existing companies received by a Federal corporation upon such exchange to be kept alive in its treasury and a separate account to be kept (unless otherwise ordered by the Federal Railway Board) of the earnings of each railway upon which there is a mortgage securing unexchanged bonds, with a view to a foreclosure of the mortgage in case the property should fail to earn the interest on all bonds secured by the mortgage, including those in the treasury of the Federal corporation.

Each Federal corporation to have power to condemn existing lines of railway (subject to existing mortgages) when authorized by the Federal Railway Board, the condemnation proceedings to be carried on through special tribunals established for that purpose.

It is not intended that all bondholders of a company whose property is acquired shall receive the par amount of their bonds in 4 per cent. guaranteed debentures and that all stockholders shall receive share for share guaranteed stock of the Federal corporation. The intention is that the aggregate amount of debentures and stock to be issued in each case shall be equitably apportioned by agreement among the stockholders and bondholders. Under such arrangement some stockholders and bondholders may receive more and some less than the par amount of their present holdings.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ABIDING QUESTIONS

BY JOSEPH S. AUERBACH

If we vaunt of war's fame
  Till throned curse it become,
And fetter'd Peace await shame
  At the Triumph of Doom;
Will through deed Joy again have expression,
  or alone in the dust-cover'd tome?

Should Wealth toil for increase
  That the poor poorer grow,
And quicken'd without cease
  Be ill seeds which men sow;
Shall such reproach be exalted, or living waters
  these dead wastes overflow?

Should old wrongs prevail still
  In contention with Right
And the Law and Good-will
  Yield their standards to Might;
Is the issue to be with the Christ, the Fates,
  or hope-dower'd, vanquishing knight?

If creeds fail at the end,
  And the priest be no more,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And prayers never ascend
To a God as of yore;
Will Faith die in the dark, or rear for the morn,
new shrines at which Truth to adore?

Are there thoughts to cherish
Of life in yon void,
Or shall we but perish,
Be enrich'd or destroy'd?
And where shall the Soul find a grave for its death,
or whither set free be convoy'd?

ABODE OF JUSTICE

Portray not purposed Justice to be blind,
Where but freed eye may know if with constraint
Truth's cause is plead, or mere dissembling plaint
Be advocate to hold in thrall the mind;
Wildered let her not grope through dark to find
The virtue, sorely overcome and faint
And mute with pallid woe, that dures attaint
Of calumny though to shame's death consign'd.

Have Justice sojourn in a temple fair,
With guerdoned sight; yet be frequented ways
Her dwelling-place, life's wastage to repair
And wrong arraign by sentence of her gaze,
To make prone worth with loveliness co-heir
Of favor, and it to joy's dawn upraise.

JOSEPH S. AUERBACH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COMMUNITY OF LANGUAGE[1]

BY JOHN GALSWORTHY

WE are celebrating the memory of a great man of Letters. What strikes me most about that golrious group of New England writers—Emerson and Longfellow, Hawthorne, Whittier, Thoreau, Motley, Holmes and Lowell—is a certain measure and magnanimity. They were rare men and fine writers, of a temper simple and unafraid.

I confess to thinking more of James Russell Lowell as a critic and master of prose than as a poet. His single-hearted enthusiasm for Letters had a glowing quality which made it a guiding star for the frail barque of culture. His humor, breadth of view, sagacity, and the all-round character of his activities has hardly been equalled in your country. Not so great a thinker or poet as Emerson, not so creative as Hawthorne, so original in philosophy and life as Thoreau, so racy and quaint as Holmes, he ran the gamut of those qualities as none of the others did; and as critic and analyst of literature surpassed them all.

But I cannot hope to add anything of value to your estimate and praise of Lowell—critic, humorist, poet, editor, reformer, man of Letters, man of State affairs. I may, perhaps, be permitted however to remind you of two sayings of his: "I am never lifted up to any peak of vision—but that when I look down in hope to see some valley of the Beautiful Mountains I behold nothing but blackened ruins, and the moans of the down-trodden the world over. . . . Then it seems as if my heart would break in pouring out one glorious song that should be the Gospel of Reform, full of consolation and strength to the oppressed—that way my madness lies." That was one side of the youthful Lowell, the generous righter of wrongs, the man. And this

[1] An address delivered before the Academy of Arts and Letters in celebration of the Lowell Centenary, February 22, 1919.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other saying: "The English-speaking nations should build a monument to the misguided enthusiasts of the plains of Shinar, for as the mixture of many bloods seems to have made them the most vigorous of modern races, so has the mingling of divers speeches given them a language which is perhaps the noblest vehicle of poetic thought that ever existed." That was the other side of Lowell, the enthusiast for Letters; and that the feeling he had about our language.

I am wondering, indeed, what those men who in the fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth centuries were welding the English language would think if they could visit this hall tonight, if suddenly we saw them sitting here among us in their monkish dress, their homespun, or their bright armor, having come from a greater Land even than America—the Land of the Far Shades. What expression should we see on the dim faces of them, as they took in the marvellous fact that the instrument of speech they forged in the cottages, courts, cloisters, and castles of their little misty island had become the living speech of half the world, and the second tongue for all the nations of the other half! For even so it is now—this English language, which they made, and Shakespeare crowned, which you speak and we speak, and men speak under the Southern Cross, and unto the Arctic Seas!

I do not think that you Americans and we English are any longer strikingly alike in physical type or general characteristics, no more than I think there is much resemblance between yourselves and the Australians. Our link is now but community of language—*and the infinity which this connotes.*

Perfected language—and ours and yours had come to flower before white men began to seek these shores—is so much more than a medium through which to exchange material commodities; it is cement of the spirit, mortar linking the bricks of our thoughts into a single structure of ideals and laws, painted and carved with the rareties of our fancy, the manifold forms of Beauty and Truth. We who speak American and you who speak English are conscious of a community which no differences can take from us. Perhaps the very greatest result of the grim years we have just been passing through is the promotion of our common tongue to the position of the universal language. The importance of the English-speaking peoples is now such that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the educated man in every country will perforce, as it were, acquire a knowledge of our speech. The second-language problem, in my judgment, has been solved. Numbers, and geographical and political accident have decided a question which I think will never seriously be reopened, unless madness descends on us and we speakers of English fight among ourselves. That fate I, at least, cannot see haunting the future.

Lowell says in one of his earlier writings: "We are the furthest from wishing to see what many are so ardently praying for, namely, a National Literature; for the same mighty lyre of the human heart answers the touch of the master in all ages and in every clime, and any literature in so far as it is national is diseased in so much as it appeals to some climatic peculiarity rather than to universal nature." That is very true, but good fortune has now made of our English speech a medium of *internationality*.

Henceforth you and we are the inhabitants and guardians of a great Spirit-City, to which the whole world will make pilgrimage. They will make that pilgrimage primarily because our City is a market-place. It will be for us to see that they who come to trade remain to worship.

What is it we seek in this motley of our lives, to what end do we ply the multifarious traffic of civilization? Is it that we may become rich and satisfy a material caprice ever growing with the opportunity of satisfaction? Is it that we may, of set and conscious purpose, always be getting the better of one another? Is it even, that of no sort of conscious purpose we may pound the roads of life at top speed, and blindly use up our little energies? I cannot think so. Surely in dim sort we are trying to realize human happiness, trying to reach a far-off goal of health and kindliness and beauty; trying to live so that those qualities which make us human beings—the sense of proportion, the feeling for beauty, pity, and the sense of humor—should be ever more exalted above the habits and passions that we share with the tiger, the ostrich, and the ape.

And so I would ask what will become of all our reconstruction in these days if it be informed and guided solely by the spirit of the market-place? Do trade, material prosperity, and the abundance of creature comforts guarantee that we advance towards our real goal? Material comfort in abundance is no bad thing; I confess to a considerable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regard for it. But for true progress it is but a flighty consort. I can well see the wreckage from the world-storm completely cleared away, the fields of life ploughed and manured, and yet no wheat grown there which can feed the spirit of man, and help its stature.

Lest we suffer such a disillusion as that, what powers and influence can we exert? There is one at least: The proper and exalted use of this great and splendid instrument, our common language. In a sophisticated world speech is action, words are deeds; we cannot watch our winged words too closely. Let us at least make our language the instrument of Truth; prune it of lies and extravagance, of perversions and all the calculated battery of partisanship; train ourselves to such sobriety of speech, and penmanship, that we come to be trusted at home and abroad; so making our language the medium of honesty and fair-play, that meanness, violence, sentimentality, and self-seeking become strangers in our lands. Great and evil is the power of the lie, of the violent saying, and the calculated appeal to base or dangerous motive; let us, then, make them fugitives among us, outcast from our speech!

I have often thought during these past years what an ironical eye Providence must have been turning on National Propaganda—on all the disingenuous breath which has been issued to order, and all those miles of patriotic writings dutifully produced in each country, to prove to other countries that they are its inferiors! A very little wind will blow those ephemeral sheets into the limbo of thin air. Already they are decomposing, soon they will be dust. To my thinking there are only two forms of National Propaganda, two sorts of evidence of a country's worth, which defy the cross-examination of Time: The first and most important is the rectitude and magnanimity of a Country's conduct; its determination not to take advantage of the weakness of other countries, nor to tolerate tyranny within its own borders. And the other lasting form of Propaganda is the work of the thinker and the artist, of men whose unbidden, unfettered hearts are set on the expression of Truth and Beauty as best they can perceive them. Such Propaganda the old Greeks left behind them, to the imperishable glory of their land. By such Propaganda Marcus Aurelius, Plutarch; Dante, St. Francis; Cervantes, Spinoza; Montaigne, Racine; Chaucer, Shakespeare; Goethe, Kant;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Turgenev, Tolstoi; Emerson, Lowell—a thousand and one more, have exalted their countries in the sight of all and advanced the stature of mankind.

You may have noticed in life that when we assure others of our virtue and the extreme rectitude of our conduct, we make on them but a sorry impression. If on the other hand we chance to perform some just act or kindness, of which they hear, or to produce a beautiful work which they can see, we become exalted in their estimation though we did not seek to be. And so it is with Countries. They may proclaim their powers from the housetops—they will but convince the wind; but let their acts be just, their temper humane, the speech and writings of their peoples sober, the work of their thinkers and their artists true and beautiful—and those Countries shall be sought after and esteemed.

We, who possess in common the English language—"best result of the confusion of tongues" Lowell called it—that most superb instrument for the making of word-music, for the telling of the truth, and the expression of the imagination, may well remember this: That, in the use we make of it, in the breadth, justice, and humanity of our thoughts, the vigor, restraint, clarity, and beauty of the setting we give to them, we have our greatest chance to make our Countries lovely and beloved, to further the happiness of mankind, and to keep immortal the priceless comradeship between us.

JOHN GALSWORTHY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN ITALIAN POETESS—ADA NEGRI

BY RUTH SHEPARD PHELPS

IT has almost ceased to be the rule for women to demand that their works of art be judged as if they were men's. That they be judged with equal severity, this indeed they do require, and are coming nearer perhaps than heretofore to getting, but fewer women now than fifty years ago would choose that their work should be mistaken for that of a man, or care to adopt a masculine pseudonym like George Eliot or George Sand, in the hope that it might be. It is well, perhaps, that women are thus developing a kind of class consciousness, which enables them to face with more equanimity the charge that this or that is "just like a woman," for it is difficult to see why it should be intrinsically more fortunate that a woman's book should be mistaken for a man's, than an Englishman's for a Russian's. Point of view contributes elements of its own to a work of art, and a woman's must necessarily be different in some respects from a man's. If she never expresses it honestly for herself, how is the one-half of the world to learn how the other half lives?

The Italian poetess who is best known today outside of her own country did not, however, begin by expressing woman as distinct from man. Her earliest book was not the voice of a woman, but the cry of a class. Such poetry was new to Italian literature, although there has seldom been a period of its history when some poetry has not been political. Most Italian poets from Dante to Carducci have diverted a part of their lyric passion from love to politics. The poets of the nineteenth century fought for the independence of Italy with both the pen and the sword, and some of the best Italian poetry must always fail to make its way across the Alps or across the Atlantic, because it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

requires such a minute knowledge of Italian history for its better understanding. But the oppression that poets had lamented in beautiful verse heretofore had been the weight of the foreigner's heel; the bitter cry of the poor had not been heard. Ada Negri's early poems, on the other hand, while they seemed to speak in the well-remembered voice of the old Lombard spirit of revolt, which Frederick II had heard lifted against him, and which spoke against the Austrian in the bloody Five Days of Milan, were railing at no political oppressor, but at the more impersonal cruelties of the social order. It was in the early nineties that they began to be heard, when readers of the well-known evening paper of Milan, *Il Corriere della sera,* experienced a gathering curiosity as to the authorship of certain fiery little poems that appeared in it from time to time. They bore the short and non-committal signature of Ada Negri, and uttered the complaint of oppressed industry, which had never made itself heard in Italian verse before. They sang, in rather rough, stirring verses, the wretchedness of the helpless and the poor, of the old, and the beaten; they described the long miseries of unemployment, mutilated hands of factory women, the workman broken by his work, the vagabond who never knew a home and who lies at last beneath the stranger's dissecting knife, the bewildered family of evicted tenants, their humble goods confessing their paucity and pitiful domestic shifts too frankly to the daylight.

Nothing was known of the writer, save what could be pieced together out of the scanty bits of information scattered through these poems. It was a woman, so much was certain. The habit of the Romance tongues, with their gracious feminine adjectives (which describe the feminine moiety of the animate and inanimate world), left no doubt of it, although she did not insist on the point as yet, nor seem to draw any material from it. And she was young:

> Mine is youth, and all of life is mine! . . .
> In the mortal struggle,
> None, none shall ever see me once repine.
> High above ruin, above cares and tears,
> Shine out my twenty years!

It could be believed that she lived at Motta-Visconti, a little village of the Lombard plain, on that river Ticino which Charles Albert crossed at the outset of his ill-fated

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

campaign of 1848, because her poems were dated from there; and it was easy to see that she worshipped her mother, who had supported her childhood with the work of her hands.

> While I, a happy child, would softly cower
> Into the pillows, sinking into sleep,
> Bent to her needle evenings, hour by hour,
> My mother watch did keep.

And again, in a poem called "The Factory Mother," we may safely substitute a daughter for the son in the poem, and find another portrait of the poetess's valiant mother.

> Her son is at his books.—She at the loom
> Pours her heart's blood out without rest or ruth.
> And of her worn old age
> She makes glad sacrifice, as once of youth.

And Ada Negri was brave:

> Who's knocking at my door?
> . . . Good day, Misfortune, thou'lt not frighten me!

But there was the acerbity of youth in her courage. Even friendship drew back from her girlish austerity that disdained laughter, while love she strove to chill and terrify with her pride.

> You, who are generous, fair, and strong,
> Ask love of me? . . . Nay, cease!
> If fate reserves you hope and song,
> Cast yourself not in my dark path.
> Go, earth is rich in love and peace,
> But I, oh youth, am wrath!

And Ada Negri was ambitious.

Conscious of her genius, and of a mission, the only lover she sought was fame, and in the "Factory Mother's" hopes for her son, it is not hard to discern her own ambitions.

> Her son, her only son,
> Her mighty pride through poverty, who now
> On his broad serious brow
> Shows to her hope the flash of genius' sun, . . .
>
> Her son shall study.—In her visions bold
> She sees him great and envied, free from dread,
> And fame for his dark head
> Shall weave a wreath of laurel and of gold.

On her own dark head, no doubt, she and her mother

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

looked to see the future lay a crown, and the present indifference of the world moves her impatience.

For all my struggles, though I curse and weep,
The world goes by and laughs, and hears me not.

These poems, and many more like them, revealing a young, rather crude, intense and honest personality, were gathered at last into a volume called "Fate" (*Fatalità*), and a preface, written for it by Signora Sofia Albisi, satisfied in part the growing curiosity of her readers. They learned that the vehement young poetess was a schoolmistress, who had to harness her genius to the humble and fatiguing task of teaching a hundred little children of Motta-Visconti their *a b c;* that she lived alone with the mother she loved, trudging to and fro to the schoolroom each day in wooden shoes; that she had never seen the sea, nor a mountain, nor a city, but had nourished all her fires of imagination on books and dreams alone. For books, it appeared, were not lacking. An anonymous admirer of her verses sent her great parcels of them from Milan by every post, with all the reviews and latest published literary gossip. With her voracity and sure instinct, she happily appropriated what she needed, and based many correct literary judgments on a hint or clue in a book review. We may not be wrong, indeed, in concluding that she read more book-reviews than books, since there are no traces of reading in her poetry, and its form does not suggest any previous study of a literature in which excellence of form has been supreme. Hers is a poetry of sincerity, of experience, and owes little to poetic tradition.

Cold, I am cold near you, old books severe!

To read *Fatalità* when it was new, was something like reading the first installment of an autobiographic novel. What would life do to this ardent, candid, young maiden spirit, endowed, it would seem, with great emotional power and sensibility, and the "experiencing nature" which heightens and interprets all personal experience? At any rate, she was not long to remain the inexperienced schoolmistress of Motta-Visconti, though she was later to realize that in the four years she spent there "had been enclosed, as in a magic ring, the best part of her life, the most ingenuous, the richest in energy and freshness." It was, as a Florentine poet was to tell her in after years, her "heroic period."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Earlier still, in her childhood, she had lived at Lodi, lived a life, as she writes long after from the safe shelter of wealth and fame, "almost cloistral, almost aristocratic, in its austere poverty. I dwelt with my mother in two small rooms on the third floor of a beautiful house in Corso Roma, overlooking the garden. The little rooms were gleaming with whitewash and cleanliness; from our tiny balconies we could see the vast garden, walled-in like a convent's, all green and silent. . . . My mother used to leave for her workroom at five o'clock in the morning, and would not return till evening. After school hours I used to stay alone with my books, almost always seated on one of the little balconies, facing that green conventual peace. I dreamed and studied much; without friends, without desires, melancholy by temperament, I would pass hours upon hours in absorbed contemplation of the slow course of the sunlight as it crept over the old garden's high ivied walls, which were overspread with climbing roses."

When she had first left her studious life of balconied meditation for the noisy roomful of children at Motta-Visconti, who submitted themselves against their will to their alphabet and ciphering, she was appalled by the shock of the contrast. Yet it was among these rough children, and in sight of the meager and difficult life their families led, that her human sympathies developed, and she came to understand poverty. "When at the age of twenty I wrote 'The Failures,' (*I Vinti*), feeling myself fairly encircled, imprisoned and oppressed by the anguish of the suffering many, I wrote in red, with the heart's blood of those who had suffered with my mother and me, the most powerful and the most characteristic of my wild rustic verses."

Fame found Ada Negri quickly after *Fatalità* opened the road, and the "Milli Prize" from Florence, which assured her for the next ten years an annuity of a few hundred dollars, was accompanied by the offer of a teaching post in the Normal School at Milan. Here she could revisit the Brera galleries, and enjoy the many wonders of city life which had so excited her during a three-day visit arranged a year or two before by her good friend Signora Albisi. Now she could share that life to the full. It was fairly certain that a part of her new experience would be that the harsh young virgin would fall in love, since she was now living for the first time among her equals, in a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

circle where intellectual and emotional cultivation might be taken for granted. And in fact the second volume of poems, *Tempeste,* bears witness to such an experience, brief but disturbing. There is suspense, absence, final desertion and disappointment; but her splendid strength reasserts itself, and the proud poem *Ego sum* declares her enfranchisement from love's sorrows, and her repossession of herself. A poem some pages farther on, entitled *Amor Novo,* suggests final recovery.

In spite of a few such autobiographical hints as these, this second volume is chiefly concerned with such subjects as filled the first. Some of the most striking pictures of poverty and industrial miseries, such as "Eviction," "The Strike," "After the Strike," are in *Tempeste,* as well as the noble and sympathetic poem, *I Grandi* (which might be rendered "The Truly Great"). These are, she says:

The Hungry, the Oppressed, who drag life's chain,
Whom Nature dealt harsh lot,
Who never knew reprieve or truce from pain,
(And yet have hated not!)
Who saw for others ripening the grain,
(And yet have pillaged not!)

Who've but a bed of straw whereon to lie,
Ailing and slow to mend;
Who've but a hospital cot whereon to die,
Yet love unto the end.

The allusion in the next but last line receives added poignancy from our knowledge that it was on a hospital bed that Ada Negri's own father had died. A poem in this same volume, *L'Ospedale Maggiore,* commemorates a visit she paid to the spot where he drew his last breath.

St. Joseph's Alley, far down to the right,
At Number Twenty. No one's in that bed,
Where years ago, this pillow at his head,
My father lay one night.

He died. And I,—frail baby in my cot,
For whom he shed his sacred dying tears,
Whom he adored,—of him, across the years,
Remember naught.

In the same year with the publication of *Tempeste,* when Ada Negri was twenty-six, came the announcement of her marriage, and readers remembered *Amor Novo.* The next volume was eight years in coming to light, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was entitled *Maternità*. Long before, in the days of her armored maidenhood when she repelled the thought of love, the maternal instinct was already articulate in her, and she invoked maternity in a poem beginning "Never a child of my own!" With her ardor of nature, and her literary habit of self-revealment, we look for and find full expression of the experience which had absorbed those eight years of silence. The emotion of the mother who is waiting for her child to come into the world,—"terrible little strange voice, which cries to the infinite tenderness of motherhood: 'Life, here am I!'"—the ecstasy of some moment when she hears her child cry out to her in a sunny April garden, the terror of the shadow that hangs over all parents, the fear that their child may die,—all these intense moments of motherhood are caught, live and palpitating, and imprisoned in words. Very striking is her "Dialogue" with her unborn child:

'Tis he—from being's depths unknown
He stirs, in dreams I hear him cry:
"In this pale, vast content am I,
Why wilt thou claim me for thine own?

"Too sad thy world; I know its gloom;
The unreturning dead have told.
I ask not life. Oh, overbold
Mother, to shape me in thy womb!" . . .

"Nay, to one solemn call above
No soul is silent, rebel none.
Child, if love light for thee the sun,
Live thou, burn thou, love back my love!"[1]

Yet with all her passion, her intelligence is not submerged; it tells her that she could endure it better than her husband if the shadow should envelop them and they should lose their child. For she would have the consolation of her art, and the relief of expression.

I? Yes, I still could bear to live,
Among her scattered, silent toys,
Her lettered blocks, her blonde-haired dolls,
That shut their china eyes—her joys!

White-haired and broken, still I'd live,
And proudly fight to my last breath
To master sorrow, and constrain,
In verses that should challenge death. . . .

[1] Dora Greenwell McChesney, in the *Thrush*, 1910.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But you, without the tiny bed
That held your blossom, your white elf,
You would not then have anything.
I know that you would kill yourself.

The marriage of Ada Negri made a great difference to her literary career, not so much in the fertility and quality of her poetry as in the way it was received. The cry of social injustice being new in Italian poetry, her poems had seemed to identify her with a movement. Arturo Giovanitti had claimed her for internationalism in "The International," calling her "the sister-of-charity of the class war," and she had become something almost legendary, a kind of Joan of Arc of the poor. The legend received a rude shock when her marriage to a wealthy manufacturer of Biella, "the Manchester of Italy," lifted her into the very class that class warfare is directed against. Reviewers of a hasty turn of mind, who were fond of catchwords, began to talk of Ada Negri's apostasy; and however unjust it may have been, some harm was assuredly done her literary reputation, in so far as that rested on the legend of the wooden shoes.

That it was unjust, any fair-minded critic cannot but feel. Her marriage did not at all destroy her sympathy for the humble and the oppressed; indeed in the poem *Amor Novo,* which we may fairly connect chronologically with her marriage, she warns her lover that he must espouse with her the cause of her poor. The poor and the suffering claimed her, she says, before he did; as long as she lives their path is hers.

It is for that you love me? Oh then, come,
Come with me, in the very name of grief. . . .

Come, come with me! Our chosen home shall be
Wherever a defeated man needs aid,
Wherever lonely childhood is afraid,
Wherever seethe the ills of poverty.

This does not sound like betrayal. In any case, she had betrayed nothing, for she had promised nothing. She had merely made the instant response of a very ardent nature to such suffering as she had seen and understood. Later she was to see and understand other kinds. Her early life had thrown her among the impoverished slaves of industry, and she interpreted them with sympathy; marriage made her a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mother, and her sympathy then went out to mothers. Many of the poems of *Maternità* sing their sorrows; a pathetic young mother, dead with her dead child in her arms; one demented with sorrow, who, unwilling to stay behind, has followed hers into the grave; the desperate one, who is driven by hunger or shame to abandon hers in the streets; the factory worker who can spare but three days in which to bring a dead child into the world—these are all brought before us in unforgettable little vignettes. It was not that Ada Negri's capacity for suffering in the sufferings of others had failed in prosperity, it was only that her sympathy had always been more personal and less sociological than it appeared.

She reversed the usual development, which is from the narrower to the wider, from the personal to the general. So far is this true that she was not to know until her thirties that kind of causeless melancholy which is oftener the indulgence of youth. Between her first three volumes of poetry and her last two, "Exile" and "Out of the Depths," there seems to have opened a gulf across her life. The fire, the struggle, the triumph of the earlier time, have given way to a dull depression, a kind of anaemia of the spirit, which seem the mark of a different personality. There are, to be sure, some objective reasons hinted at. A second baby girl has been born to her, only to die at the end of a month; she feels the first chill of middle age, "the melancholy of the first gray hairs"; her remaining daughter will soon be out of childhood, less dependent and less near; she has had a long sickness which threatened to prove mortal; society has claimed and tamed her, and left her half cynical and disillusioned.

> You do not know me? I may seem
> More fair to-day, more flexible
> In my smooth sheath of tawny velvet
> Which likens me unto a panther.
> I know now how to do my hair in waves,
> As well as ladies who go past in carriages;
> I now can feign a smile,
> Even while my heart breaks; I can break a promise,
> Give, with a cup of tea, my hand
> To those who turn their backs upon my door
> To tear my name to tatters, and my heart.

Her heart aches, "as if they had trampled me underfoot," she has lost faith and thinks of suicide. Where now the valor of her strenuous girlhood, which defied misfortune

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to frighten her, and bade misery good day? There is nothing left of it but the restlessness and rebellion. Her courage had perhaps exhausted itself against the external obstacles of poverty and oblivion; against the inward foes of the spirit there was no fight left in her. Then, too, for her it was so evidently true that

> That age is best which is the first.

for by the time she was thirty the factory woman's daughter had left her wooden shoes outside the door of a palace, and gone to live inside it, and had received the two guerdons she had most desired from life, motherhood and fame. The end of the serial came too soon. "Man's aim is to culminate," remarked Meredith; "but it is the saddest thing in the world to feel that we have accomplished it." Ada Negri had now to seek new occasions for living, or do without. She had not books to fall back upon, for hers is not a learned muse; and the writing impulse, while it did not fail her, just as she had prophesied it would not, did not suffice to keep alive her wish to live beyond the *quarantaine*. Perhaps, she says to the woman in the glass,

> Perhaps, poor soul,
> To perish in thy Spring were wise,
> Ere time, more fearful far than death,
> Make thee a stranger to thine eyes.
> Perhaps, poor soul,
> To close thyself the door were sweet—
> The door of dark and silence—while
> Thine eyes still glow with youth's last smile.

It is not possible to imagine the grave intellectualism of Alice Meynell or the high spirituality of Emily Dickinson permitting either to address herself thus; and Christina Rossetti, faced with this crisis in a woman's life, "answered 'Yea!'" But a woman of Latin race would feel more sharply the failure of her *vie de femme*. Even a poetess does not know how to survive her *roman*. For strangely enough, since it was never love that she asked of the gods, save once or twice in mere lip-service to rhetoric, it is precisely her *roman* that Ada Negri in her later verse bewails and invokes. It is as if outraged Aphrodite were avenging herself on the proud virgin of *Fatalità*, when Ada Negri owns to herself, in "Confession," and "To the One Who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Never Came," that the spring of her life is broken because no one has ever moved her to the love of which she was capable.

> I was none other's, yet was never thine.
> I am my own,

she writes—to whom? To the stranger she writes:

> I waited for you long after that day
> When first I knew that I had come to flower,
> A March primrose. One came, with true heart's dower.
> But " 'Tis not he!" my heart did softly say.
>
> Sunshine and rain, thorns, roses, chaff and wheat,
> The years brought to me. Love they brought me too.
> But brought not you! Yet one resembled you,
> Who knew to take my heart with magic sweet.
>
> I lost myself, my pride aside I threw.
> . . . It was not you!

In a group of affectionate domestic poems in *Maternità* entitled *Dolcezze,* and dedicated " To Giovanni," there occurs this stanza:

> To tell the tender love
> Which binds my heart to thy true heart alone—
> That love thou doubtest of!—
> See at thy feet, what flowers on flowers I've thrown!

But it is evident that the instinct of her lover was sure. " Tender love," though sincere and wishful to be satisfying, was not all that her nature could have been moved to, and in " Confession " she admits it.

> Now when the night weighs heavy on the pain
> Of them that watch, and you are face to face
> With your sole self, alone and cold in space,
> Wrapped in your shift, as penitents have lain. . . .
>
> Conress that your rebellious disaccord
> Is nothing but a wail of sick distress
> From a weak soul who missed her happiness
> Because she failed to find her heart's true lord. . . .
>
> And—though to say it be like a whip-stroke
> Upon your pride—that if tomorrow he
> Should come to you with arms outstretched, you'd be
> The very slave of love, and love your yoke!

If Ada Negri's poems succeed, in her own proud phrase, in " challenging death," it will be more for their human

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than for their literary value. Hers is a poetry without art and largely without form; it has little melodic beauty, and she comes cheaply off for her rhymes in a language where nearly all participles and infinitives can be made to chime. It is a poetry which is not poetic. But it is the direct, unforced expression of a deep sincerity, that has carrying power in all departments of life. She has broken through the literary woman's frequent reticence, a reticence that masks itself below a flood of misleading words, and has been frank where she might have dressed her emotions prettily in plumes borrowed from man's view of her. It has not been, it would seem, a difficult frankness. Ada Negri gives to a singular degree the impression of having written in the only way it was possible to her to write, her verse having been forced from her by the power of her feeling and of her impulse to self-expression.

But while she has thus given us some authentic documents of feminine psychology, a field in which most published knowledge has come at second hand, (through observation), it is safe to prophesy that she will be remembered as the author of *I Vinti* and *I Grandi* rather than of *Confessione*. That is partly, of course, because of the legend, because of the personal appeal of the poor and proud young schoolmistress of Motta-Visconti. Her own eyes and heart evidently turn back with regretful longing to her "heroic period," and we may leave her with a quotation from the most finished of her poems, "The Return to Motta-Visconti," whither she makes a sad pilgrimage, her baby girl tugging at her skirts, to look for her lost youth, and "that past of struggle and of hope, her rebellious, splendid past."

She saw again the twenty-year-old girl,
Her forehead marked with destiny's bright ray,
Trip down the steep roadway,
A proud young eaglet, winged and strong.
Her room, full of bright ghosts, she saw again,
The bed, where sleepless nights were full of song;
She seemed to see from her own veins the blood
Pour forth into her rhymes its flood,
Rhymes that went through the world upborne by pain,
That seemed a tocsin bell,
Of bare homes without bread or fire to tell,
And the dull grief of earth's defeated ones.

RUTH SHEPARD PHELPS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LEAVES OF JAPANESE POETRY

BY GERTRUDE EMERSON

I

I CHANCED to be idling along the main street of the little village of Nikko looking into shop windows one autumn morning, when the wind was whistling down the mountains through his teeth. Many of the shops were already boarded up, the transient trade of summer tourists gone with the butterflies, but there was one whose windows still presented a tempting display of old blue and white porcelain, bronze bells, incense burners, carved and lacquered bowls, and all that assortment of small, fashioned things which speak so eloquently the language of a different age than ours. Out in front was the shop-keeper, rubbing his hands with the cold, and bowing and smiling an invitation to enter. A threshold always signifies possible adventure. As soon as I had passed into the shop my eyes fell upon a small crêpe paper book, called *Sword and Blossom Poems,* lying on the edge of a table. Blue waves were chasing one another across its covers, half hidden by scalloped clouds of orange and purple, and scattered grey cherry blossoms. I do not remember now which poem I read first, but it may have been this one:

> I have so long been sick, I cannot tell
> What path the spring has taken, yet I fear
> That long ago the cherry blossom fell
> For which mine eyes had waited all the year.

There is a picture by Koho illustrating it—a temple pagoda rising from among green tree-tops, and on the opposite page, under a cherry tree from which all the blossoms are gone, an old man in a blue coat and a yellow kimono leaning pensively on his staff. A brief introduction to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

volume stated that the score of verses contained within its covers were translations of classic Japanese poems written over a thousand years ago.

When I returned to Tokyo a few days later, I wrote to a young friend of mine and asked him if he would not come and teach me a little about the spirit of poetry in his country. He had a very strange and intense feeling for English, this Japanese boy: feelings strange and intense on many subjects. I do not think he ever quite understood why I bothered so much about the question of poetry. It was all so very natural and simple, and there were other questions infinitely more important. For instance, when a young man graduates from a government Middle School, what attitude is he going to adopt toward compulsory military service? Loyalty to the Emperor and to one's country constitute the first principles of living, but it is hard to give up three years of one's life to learn how to become an excellent machine, if one has a passion for books and study, and a shrinking from the brutality of war.

"But sometimes I think the purpose of life is that you should do all things you do not want to do!" he said once with an almost ascetic fervor. It was as though the circles of his questioning had broken with a faint metallic clang on the far shore of some impregnable ground.

I found it curiously difficult to get him to say anything concrete, to set any formula, to establish any landmark, whereby one might recognize the tidal ebb and flow, or the little lanes and currents, of Japanese poetic expression, and in the end I was forced to fall back on a system of mechanical questions. Then, in his soft voice, hesitating now and then for the right word, he would answer to the best of his ability. Always with a puzzled air, as if he did not quite grasp the why and wherefore of this alien questing after his country's gods. He was very gentle, almost shy; with a laugh that rustled like a paper fan.

Outside the snow fell in flurries, and great crows, calling raucously to one another, came and perched on the cedar tree in the garden or ate the little scarlet, lace-like leaves that still clung desperately to the bare branches of the maple trees; or maybe there was fine, misty grey rain, or real sunshine sliding up the steep slopes of the tiled roofs. The afternoons were always short, for he came after school hours, and very soon the blue shadows would sweep down Valley

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Street and the lantern fireflies come out here and there: and in the temple compound at the foot of the hill, the paper *shoji* gleamed through the gathering dusk. Sometimes, if the day had been clear, Fuji hung like a purple veil at the end of the tilted street. It was then that the Japanese maid brought the tea, and we put away the disconnected notes for another day, without sorting them.

II

One forgets, and remembers with increasing astonishment, how long ago a great part of this Japanese poetry was written down. Before King Alfred was born in England a significant collection of 4496 poems of old Japan, in twenty volumes, called the *Manyoshiu,* or Myriad Leaves, had already been made. In 905 a second collection, the *Kokinshiu*, a Record of Ancient Things, was compiled, and in 1235 the *Hyakuninishiu,* or Hundred Poems of a Hundred Poets, gained a popularity which they have not forfeited to this day. Still other important collections followed, made always by Imperial order, known under the general name of the Anthologies of the One-and-Twenty Reigns.

We are told of strange "poem parties" in those earlier days of Japanese history—of the River Winding Festivals, when lords and ladies and the throng of the Nara Court, even unto the Emperor himself, descended to the banks of a stream to launch little cups of rice-wine and tilt in the making of such verses as this one:

> No man so callous but he heaves a sigh
> When o'er his head the withered cherry flowers
> Come floating down. Who knows? The spring's soft showers
> May be but tears shed by the sorrowing sky.[1]

If spring and love were not the theme, then surely it was the sorrow of autumn, for the stops are few and often played upon in this ancient poetry of the Nara epoch.

There were even more fantastic gatherings when the Court was holding holiday for three centuries in Kyoto. The *uta-awase* assumed the proportions of the most elaborate of state ceremonies. Rare flowering trees and plants decorated the Imperial halls, where the assemblage, glittering and stiff in gorgeous brocade, solemnly concocted poetry

[1] B. H. Chamberlain, *Japanese Classical Poetry.* London, 1880.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

according to rules as formal as court etiquette. It must have been on such occasions as these that Tadahira, younger brother of the leader of the great Fujiwara family and himself a proven warrior, won lasting fame by his inspiration of uttering the cry of a cuckoo every time he opened the fan upon which he had painted an image of that noble bird. The making of many an official of state hung on a thread slender as the ability to turn an effective conceit in verse.

It was in the Kyoto or Heian era (A. D., 798-1192) that the poetic mania of Japan reached its height. When the flood of Chinese influence swept over the country through the Korean gate, ear-marking for all time the religion, the art, the learning, all the complicated ceremonial of life, it scarcely touched the poetry. This was, and remained, one of the few original productions of the Japanese genius. Perhaps there was something alien in Chinese literature, something too philosophic, over-passionate, which was unacceptable to Japanese taste. But although Chinese influence did not directly mold the poetry of Japan, the Chinese culture which was superimposed on the country was responsible for much that was significant in its subsequent development. A material and artistic civilization was the first result of Chinese domination, a civilization in which religious concepts exercised little or no restraining influence, as in the T'ang and Sung periods in China. The history of the Heian epoch is the succession of stages by which a culture based on principles of aristocracy alone precipitated its own ruin —refinement of idle pastimes, sensuousness, unparalleled extravagance, excesses of every kind.

Art has always reserved unto itself the high privilege of selection. Poetry but lifts the hem of its garment above the general contamination: the contrast between dreams and reality is only the more poignant. Tsurayuki, a nobleman of the first half of the tenth century, writes from the center of the licentious court life delicate verses about gathering simples on the hills, fantasies as illusive as dragon flies:

> As on the mountains, when the clouds above
> Fall to the earth in mist—a man may see
> The dim white blossom of some cherry tree,
> So only have I seen the one I love.[1]

[1] *Sword and Blossom Poems*, done in English verse by Shotaro Kimura and Charlotte M. A. Peake.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The usual explanation is that the large number of women writers influenced for the better the literature of the period. There were indeed some of signal distinction: the pathetic figure of Ono no Komachi, and Murasaki Shikibu, author of the most famous of Japanese classical romances. A typical bit of fleeting verse has come down from the brush of Murasaki Shikibu:

> I wandered out this moonlight night,
> I think that someone hurried by,
> But ah, the clouds obscured the light. . . .
> I only heard a wind-blown sigh!

However true it may be that women influenced the character of the poetry—in its lack of robustness, its flower-like grace, a certain indefinable exquisiteness—the particular point of propriety does not rest with them. They did not possess it. It belongs rather to the rigid code of etiquette which prescribed that even the most profligate courtesan should go abroad with her face modestly covered, and converse with her lover through a paper door or from behind a screen; to that formalism which has grown around the heart of life in Japan and stifled natural expression.

The Imperial suzerainty was finally thrust aside by the rising military class. In 1189 the seat of power was shifted from Kyoto to Kamakura, the stronghold of the military Shogun, although Kyoto continued as the official capital of Japan for several centuries later. The spirit of Buddhism at last burst into full flower and the general tone of life changes. . . . A stream of men on every side hurrying to cast off worldly garments and flee to the mountains to live as hermits among the rocks! Grown weary of idle amusements, they turn in increasing numbers to the religion which tells them that existence is as fleeting as a drop of dew. A subtle change creeps over the poetry. It becomes as philosophic as the narrow compass of form permits, and it is permeated with the poet-priest's love of nature, the vibrant background to all his solitary contemplations. He writes:

> Alas! unworthy, I . . . and yet I dare
> To spread my ample black-dyed sleeve and bless
> This people whose sad burdens I must share,
> Dwelling apart in mountain wilderness.

Something of the struggle of trying to reconcile life with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the mystic operation of the universe begins to appear in the little verses:

> Ye who are sad, if it should chance that when
> Ye thought to leave the fretful world and go
> Far up among the silent hills of snow
> That there ye found no peace at last—what then?

What then indeed! Will the echoing hills, or the pitiless sky, or the passing wind, or the wild geese with wings intercrossed in the white clouds, give any answer to satisfy the aching human breast?

One other great movement was to occur as the result of long centuries of military suppression, a bloodless revolution fraught with vast potentialities: the upward struggle of the lower classes, or, if you will, the widening downward of aristocratic privileges. It was the Tokugawa Shogunate (1603-1867) that threw wide the gates of progress with an end to the long period of feudal quarrels and the establishment of peace throughout the country. The abolition of the *samurai,* education for the masses, the growth of intellectual commerce with other nations, the rise of business enterprise and full-fledged industrialism and, finally, the voluntary grant of a constitutional charter by the restored Emperor, descendant of the gods—and old Japan passed away forever!

> At night I sit and looking o'er the fields
> Think of the myriad poor and of their years
> Of patient toil that scanty comfort yields,
> And as I think, my sleeves are wet with tears.

The tender solicitude of Her Imperial Majesty, consort of Mutsuhito, Emperor of the Meiji era, expresses no modern note of sympathy for the lot of the common people, as one might at first think, corresponding to the romantic awakening after the classical period in English poetry. Sovereignty by Divine Right was always identical in Japan with benevolent despotism (made possible by the docility and good will of the Japanese people). Chinese culture had long since faded like a rain-washed camelia flower, ceasing to be any inspiration in the living thought of the day. If Western mechanism offered an all too seductive substitute, and furnished the military technique presently responsible for Japan's bold claim to leadership in the Far East, it was scarcely conducive to the production of good

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poetry. Such as there was merely reflected the windless flame of thought out of other days and clung tenaciously to forms not new a thousand years ago. It is too soon to tell what springtide of blossoms grafted stocks may bring forth. Japan is alert to all trends of modern expression in art, and significant departures have been made, but so far as actual output of distinctive genius is concerned, both the quality and quantity are disappointingly small.

III

It is true that Japanese poetry "knows nothing of rhyme, assonance, alliteration, accented stress, quantity, or parallelism," but it is nevertheless governed by very definite principles of composition. The most obvious of these, and the simplest, is a syllabic cadence following from alternating lines of five and seven syllables. In the form called *naga-uta,* literally long-poem, the lines alternate indefinitely. These poems partake of the nature of epics, usually narrating historic feats of valor or dwelling on the glories of battle. From the eighth century downward the tendency was toward a shorter verse form, and the *tanka,* composed of five lines of 5-7-5-7-7 syllables respectively, became the standard form for all poetry. For a mind steeped in the unlimited variety of complicated Western forms of versification it is difficult to conceive how a simple stanza of only thirty-one syllables, corresponding most nearly to our quatrain, was able to satisfy every need of poetic expression among a people as rich in artistic tradition as the Japanese. The spirit of uniform adherence to an established code or standard, the formal repression of the East resulting from long centuries of ingrowing culture, so puzzling to the West accustomed to a spontaneous yielding to individual impulse, must offer what explanation there is. At any rate, a sense of selection which is carried to the highest point of elimination directs the poet as it guides the brush of the artist and maker of *ukioye* prints. Even the *tanka* proved too long for popular taste, and gave forth in the seventeenth century an offshoot known as *haikai* or *hokku.* The *hokku* came into vogue through the literary pastime of capping the verses of *tanka,* the object being to propose a situation of some complexity that would require ingenuity of conclusion, or contrariwise. Presently the second part of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the poem was dropped off, and the initial hemistich of seventeen syllables came to stand as a definite verse form. *Haikai* won immediate popular favor, and came to be invested with a spirit of wit, of play on words, sometimes even of buffoonery, quite far removed from the classical *tanka.* Poetry in seventeen syllables! Can any other nation boast as much?

The Japanese themselves consider only their *tanka* as the perfect expression of their poetic emotions. It is in the form of *tanka* that today several thousand verses are presented to the Imperial Poetry Bureau at New Year's, upon some subject designated by the Empress—" Bamboos in the Snow," " The Stork on the Pine Tree," " The Cedar by the Shrine "—contending for no prize except selection to be read aloud before the Emperor and Empress and members of the Court. The subject thereafter flaunts itself for the year as one of the commonest motifs of ornamentation, wherever the quick fancy and nimble fingers of the Japanese can devise ornamentation.

The most important principle of construction, syllabic arrangement, thus defines the few distinct forms of Japanese poetry. It is the rhythm of verse corresponding to our measured feet. The stanzaic system, beyond the alternating 5 and 7-syllabled lines of the *naga-uta,* has never existed, and there is no rhyme, since all the words of the Japanese language end in one of the five vowels or in *n,* and rhyme could mean only a monotonous repetition of similar sounds. Toward the close of the sixteenth century the language underwent decided changes and new canons of poetry began to be formulated. Many technical words and words denoting abstractions, with finer shades of meaning, were taken over from the Chinese, colloquialisms multiplied. The grammar itself was simplified through the influence of the uninflectional form of Chinese. Poets resented these " barbarisms," and established a mold of expression in which a purely native vocabulary and archaic construction were maintained.

Among the few points of technical construction that can be analyzed, the *makura-kotoba,* translated as pillow-words, are the most curious. They were originally not unlike the stock epithets of Greek poetry, but in course of time came to be applied to words of remote analogy, or were subject to certain letter changes, so that they lost all significance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A second characteristic in construction is the extensive use of the so-called pivot-word, in which two words are abbreviated and their syllables combined, or in which a word with a double meaning is used when both meanings are necessary to the sense. The vast number of homonyms in the language facilitates this mode of expression, and the restriction of space encourages it. It is not an attempt at punning in our usual understanding of that word, but is rather an intensive use of Japanese. A third distinctive ear-mark is the use of expletives frequently untranslatable beyond an exclamation point, introduced at the beginning, the middle, or the end of the poem to mark a stop somewhat like a caesural pause. The most common ones are *ya, kana, keri, taru.*

There have been times in the history of Japanese poetic literature when the most minute details were under regulation, such as the proper sequence of colors in a poem or the exact number of adjectives to be employed: when the dictates of a meretricious form entirely destroyed any quality of poetry. Even today the manner of writing down a poem, the size and shape of the paper, are immutably established.

Chomei, a twelfth century recluse, in attempting to define the proper limitations for the subject matter of poetry, writes:

> If a flower is the subject, the poem must be wrought with deep feeling: wishes of infinite joy and constant love should be expressed. . . . One must always take care not to err in the subject matter described by the poem, but to hold a subject too firmly is also bad. For example the cuckoo being the subject, the poet's mind may search the heights in mountain and field, and describe the song as if he really heard it; but he must never say he wanted the nightingale to sing. The poet may search for cherry blossoms but never for the willow; he may expectantly look for the first snow but never for autumn rains or hailstorm. He may offer his life for the fading flowers, but never for maple leaves.

Chomei seems to have meant simply that the poet must identify his mood with that of the bird, the flower, the falling leaf, in accordance with a very definite symbolic interpretation of nature.

> Was it the moon herself that just now uttered
> the cry of the cuckoo?

"The bird flies very swiftly. When the poet turns his head, the moon alone is shining, so he doubts if the moon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

did not sing its cry," explained my Japanese student with patient elaboration.

Under the mosquito net: moonlight flooding in,
and the lone cry of the cuckoo!

"Its meaning is very peaceful night," was the laconic interpretation.

The cuckoo is the friend of the poet in his solitary hours —it is moonshine, the voice of the fields and wooded hills calling to him their companionship. But the song of the *hototogisu,* the Japanese nightingale, has another message:

Passionate music of the Nightingale,
Not joy you bring me, but a strange regret,
A memory of nothingness, the pale
Face of a lover I have never met.

A delicate oriental conception, full of bitter pain. It is for this reason that the poet may not ask to hear its song. And the flowers, too, have each a special significance. The lotos, rising fresh and pure from the stagnant river-bed, is the mystic symbol of Buddhism, of the transitoriness of life. The plum-blossom, coming when the snow is often still upon the ground and everything is cold and barren, represents the beauty of constancy. A hundred times does the poet go forth to lose his way in the snow of cherry blossoms that have drifted across the mountain paths. He sleeps at a little inn and dreams of the dear delight of the spring days:

Sometimes before my casement bars I place
A lighted lamp, and in the gloom outside
I watch the cherry petals softly glide
Like snow, lighting awhile the black earth's face.

The Japanese find a perfect symbol for the transient character of life's loveliness in the cherry blossom. It opens to the first warm sun of April and is gone with the first wind.

Even love itself dare not be free in its self-revelation.

Thou wilt return to me. Why should I grieve
For such short parting? Yea, thy words are true,
I will not weep. See these are drops of dew,
Not tears—not tears, that glitter on my sleeve.

Since the imagination cannot be adequately stimulated in a brief space except by a very specific image, nature is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never described generally, but in some minute phase or arrested detail of her every-day existence. The close observation that we point out as a great gift among certain of our poets exists everywhere as a commonplace in Japan. The dragon fly trying in vain to alight on a blade of grass, the noisy cicada shrilling from the garden, the sound of the pounding of rice in the moonlight at the mountain temple, an old decaying shrine from which the paint is peeling, butterflies lingering in the wet grass after the light of morning has broken, the fishing-stakes of the river coming out one by one through the mists of the early dawn—these are the pictures of Japanese poems. Realism exists, but not for its own sake. Everything speaks in terms of something else. Dragon flies are the horses ridden by the spirits of the dead; the cicada casts off its shell, which becomes a symbol of the emptiness of life; tears are not tears, but dew.

"Up and down of peaks, come and go of clouds, do not give definite feeling, but flowers blooming, leaves falling—we know everything else. In spring plum-blossoms and cherries are out, butterflies wander, larks sing, rice puts out green shoots in the field, and warm breeze blows about in the valley. In summer mosquitoes come, bats fly, leaves grow thick and remember the cool fountains in the rocks. In autumn rice-plants ripen, dragon-flies ride, the moon shines brightly. In winter leaves fall down, snows and hails come, people sit around *hibachi* warming their hands day long and night short. The train of our thought is very complicated. We think of many things." So spoke my friend, his eyes staring vaguely into a world of Japanese realities.

GERTRUDE EMERSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ROOSEVELT[1]

BY WHITNEY WARREN

L'HOMME qui vient de mourir est le premier qui, non seulement aux Etats-Unis, mais dans le monde entier, se soit ouvertement, publiquement déclaré pour la France et pour les Alliés. Je ne sais si on a fait suffisamment ressortir, dans les articles qu'on lui a consacrés ces derniers temps, son rôle de précurseur. C'est quelque chose, cependant, d'avoir montré la voie à des millions d'êtres, d'avoir été le guide et la lumière de l'Humanité. Mais bornons nous à l'Amérique. Sa destinée pendant la guerre, c'est Roosevelt qui l'a forgée, et nous n'avons rien accompli sans qu'il l'ait prédit et voulu.

Les premières paroles qui soient tombées de ses lèvres, en août 1914, furent celles-ci: " Je suis avec la France parce que le droit est de son côte; si le droit était du côté de l'Allemagne, c'est avec elle que je serais." Phrases directes et claires, telles qu'il avait l'habitude d'en prononcer et qui, aujourd'hui, semblent toutes naturelles. Mais qu'on fasse un retour en arrière, qu'on se replace à l'époque du doute où elles furent dites, quand les Etats-Unis, gangrénés par les mensonges allemands, submergés par la propagande allemande, hésitaient *à* désigner et *à* reconnaître le camp de la justice! Roosevelt, qui n'ignorait rien de l'Allemagne, qui, au cours de ses voyages, l'avait étudiée et comprise, ne fut pas dupe, un seul moment, de la comédie d'innocence qu'elle jouait à la face des neutres. Il savait qu'elle avait prémédité son agression; il savait que toute son éducation, depuis quarante ans, la dirigeait vers le crime; aucun prétexte, aucune excuse ne purent le tromper, parce qu'il était, ce que nous appelons *" a man of the world,"* un citoyen du monde, aux yeux ouverts vers le dehors, sur l'étendue d'où nait la clarté.

[1] From *La Renaissance,* February 1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Il représentait un type d'homme bien particulier; il était exceptionnel en toute chose, et bien fait, par là même, pour être à la fois écouté et décrié. Les êtres que rien n'intimide, qui ont une forte personnalité et ne l'abdiquent jamais, exercent un grand ascendant, même s'ils sont seuls à lutter contre tous. S'ils sont isolés, c'est parce qu'ils dominent. Ce fut le cas de Roosevelt. Au début des hostilités, il rencontra des haines, de l'indifférence, à peine quelques approbations, mais, malgré tout, ce fut sa voix qui prévalut, et les plus ardents à le combattre, les moins zélés à l'écouter, finirent par agir exactement comme s'ils étaient ses disciples. C'est l'honneur et la prérogative des grands hommes d'imposer leur vues à leurs ennemis mêmes.

Si l'Histoire est vraiment ce qu'on nous assure qu'elle est, si elle tient les promesses qu'on attend d'elle, si elle est le juge impartial des siècles, des époques, des générations, des individus, elle proclamera qu'en dehors de Roosevelt personne ne peut revendiquer la gloire d'avoir arraché les Etats-Unis à la honte de la neutralité. Il sut, par ses discours, par ses conversations, par ses écrits, former autour de lui le premier noyau de ceux qui s'insurgèrent contre la méprisable passivité à laquelle les diplomates, les politiciens, les sceptiques, les endormeurs de tout rang prétendaient nous condamner. Il fut le premier soldat américain enrôlé dans les rangs de l'Entente, et, depuis l'instant où il eût pris parti, pas un jour ne s'écoula qui ne lui apportât un contingent de convertis. La cause de la France, pour nous, là-bas, c'était lui qui la personnifiait; il fut l'ambassadeur du Droit, l'avocat de la souffrance injuste, le grand esprit centralisateur qui groupa les énergies bienfaisantes de la nation, l'âme de la résistance à l'emprise germanique. Qu'on fut politiquement son ami ou son adversaire, on ne pouvait pas devenir clairvoyant sans le reconnaître pour un chef ni sans se dire: " J'ai fait ce que Roosevelt réclamait."

Ce qui lui manqua, ce fut l'autorité directe qui permet de prendre les décisions au nom de la masse. S'il en avait disposé, les Etats-Unis seraient bien certainement entrés en guerre longtemps avant 1917. Qu'on songe au nombre d'existences qui auraient été épargnées si nous avions moins hésité, moins tergiversé, moins retardé le moment du sacrifice. Il n'y a pas en France de mère, de femme, de sœur en deuil qui ne soit fondée à regretter son absence du pouvoir, au moment où, d'un geste, il aurait pu nous engager

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

et éviter au monde de longs et cruels mois de douleur. Il n'avait pas d'autre horizon, d'autre intérêt que ceux de l'humanité; il la voulait tout entière coalisée contre ses oppresseurs, à la fois pour augmenter son honneur et pour restreindre ses pertes. En sorte que, sous son aspect belliqueux, il était, plus que tout autre, soucieux de ménager le sang, mais il lui importait peu de savoir à quelle race, à quelle nation appartenait ce sang; au total, si même un plus grand nombre d'Américains avait dû périr, moins de sang humain aurait été versé. Voilà encore une manière d'aimer l'humanité. Il n'est pas dit que ce soit la moins bonne.

La disparition de Roosevelt est irréparable. Les Etats-Unis sont privés de leur plus belle énergie et d'un esprit doué, au suprême degré, pour comprendre la réalité. Son sens pratique va nous faire grandement défaut à une heure où, avant de s'abandonner aux utopies, il convient de liquider une situation de fait extrêmement grave et extremement embrouillée. S'il avait été là, ses idées sur la paix auraient fini par triompher, à l'exemple de ses idées sur la guerre. Il aurait apporté, par sa plume et par sa parole, à la solution des problèmes ardus de l'heure, sa grande clairvoyance, son bon sens, son goût inné de l'équité; il aurait préconisé et obtenu le châtiment complet des coupables et la récompense intégrale des justiciers. Je dis qu'il l'aurait obtenu, car il aurait eu derrière lui tout le peuple américain. Les dernières élections sont, à ce point de vue, très significatives. Qu'on n'en doute pas; elles marquent la victoire de Roosevelt et de ce qu'il représentait, de son esprit, de ses tendances. Du moins sa mémorie subsiste. Il n'a pas péri tout entier; il a laissé, à travers tout le pays et dans toutes les âmes, une empreinte ineffaçable. Ses doctrines, ses procédés sont conformes à notre tradition, et quand un Américain retombe sur son fonds, il revient aux idées de Roosevelt.

Il ne s'agit pas ici de politique intérieure. Les questions qui sont actuellement l'objet de la discussion des Alliés nous occupent seules. De l'aveu général, elles dépassent l'entendement des hommes les plus avertis et des intelligences les plus élevées. On fera pour le mieux, c'est entendu. Mais ce mieux, comment le déterminer, sinon en s'inspirant des exemples du passé et des grands morts dont la pensée demeure? Vouloir régler l'avenir, par divination, c'est risquer une expérience grosse peut-être de dangers plus

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

graves que ceux qu'on pense éviter. Les conceptions de Roosevelt—on sait d'ailleurs qu'elles ne manquaient pas de hardiesse—avaient, toutes, leur racine dans la connaissance des hommes et de l'histoire. Personne n'est plus digne que lui d'inspirer les résolutions qui seront prises autour du tapis vert. En ce qui concerne les Etats-Unis, leur action ne sera bienfaisante et équitable, j'en suis convaincu, que pour autant qu'elle sera d'accord avec les principes dont Roosevelt s'était fait le champion, et nos diplomates ne seront sûrs d'avoir bien défendu les intérêts de l'humanité que si le souvenir de ce grand citoyen commande leur décision, et s'ils peuvent se dire " Si Roosevelt vivait, il nous aurait approuvé."

WHITNEY WARREN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BOOK OF THE MONTH

LITERATURE UNVEILED[1]

BY LAWRENCE GILMAN

THE Comic Spirit is a tethered filly these days—or at most she is goaded into becoming an Irish bull and uttering a horse laugh of cynical derision at the international spectacle; yet we cannot but think (to change again the metaphorical gear) that one of her old-time silvery peals would result from her observation of that moment in Mr. Albert Mordell's psychoanalytical unveiling of the Literary Great wherein he seeks to give us the Freudian view of Browning. Reading Mr. Mordell's blithely Boccaccioistic diagnosis of *The Last Ride Together,* and remembering the generation of austerely puritan Browning Clubs that guilelessly exposed themselves to this apparently innocent poem of the master's, one cannot but join in concert with those relaxing peals of pure joy. Browning, Mr. Mordell remarks, "wrote rarely of sex"; but he warns us against "those innocent poems of the poet where we have no doubt there must be sex symbolism." Of course it is precisely in these seemingly "innocent" aesthetic expressions (as every good Freudian knows) that that ubiquitous Bolshevik, Suppressed Libido, is most divertingly concealed.

We shall not dull the edge of the classic Browningite's reaction to Mr. Mordell's interpretation of *The Last Ride Together* by attempting a conveyance of it. We should perhaps not be thanked. Certainly Mr. Mordell will not be. But then he is not writing primarily for the Elderly Virgins of culture, either male or female. "The critic who examines literary masterpieces to find sexual symbols will not be a popular one," he admits; "but that does not

[1] *The Erotic Motive in Literature,* by Albert Mordell. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1919.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alter the fact that the sexual meaning is there. The field will no doubt be taken up in the future by some critic who will not fear to brave public wrath." Who could say that Mr. Mordell is afraid? Yet, faithful Freudian that he is, he knows that insistence upon the sexual aspect of this matter of aesthetic psychomancy is about as soothing to the Elderly Virgins of culture as a red flag to a stock-broker. He remembers, no doubt, what Hitschmann says in the introduction to his *Freud's Theories of the Neuroses:* that "by far the greatest and most universal opposition raised against the Freudian doctrines has been because of the disclosure of an unfailing sexual agency in the causation of neurotic manifestations. Here the resistance, a normal one, lies in the nature of the thing itself, since both healthy and slightly neurotic individuals are inclined for intelligible reasons to deny the paramount importance of sexuality: the healthy, because it constitutes no problem for them; the others, because of their unconscious need to spread a veil over their own weaknesses. . . ." Such protestants "stand under the ban of that combination of prudery and lust which governs the attitude of most cultivated people in sexual matters." Those who recoil from this phase of Freud's theory of the strict determinism of all psychic processes are betrayed, as Hitschmann points out, by their narrow reading of the term "sexual." As Freud uses it, and as his literary disciple Mr. Mordell uses it, all but the ingenuous and the bigoted understand a denotement not only of the physical activities of the sexual life, but also of its "phantasies"—its phychic overtones.

Such elementary clarifications as these, which Mr. Mordell is at pains to make before he gets under way in his study, are, naturally, commonplaces to the student of modern explorations into the unconscious. No doubt Mr. Mordell had to establish certain comforting premises. It would have been heartless not to reassure those who will be horrified by his cheerful juggling with such terrifying verbal spheroids as "sadism," "narcissism," "masochist," "homosexualist"; yet we cannot help wishing that, after observing that "the ideas advanced here will displease the puritanical opponents of scientific research," he had refrained from adding this unctuous sop: "The 'unconscious,' besides containing the seeds of crime and immorality, also is the soil of all those finer emotions that the church and the state

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cherish." The survivors of a million Browning Clubs will need much more detailed and emphatic reassurance than is to be found in that pious gesture before they can forgive Mr. Mordell for his unveiling of *The Last Ride Together.*

Mr. Mordell's book provides rare sport. Mainly, because of the joyous enthusiasm with which he seeks to demonstrate his thesis that " many writers who were deemed respectable and pure because they never dealt with sexual problems are full of sex symbolism. They consciously strove to conceal their sex interest, but their unconscious use of sex symbolism shows that they were not as indifferent to the problems as they would lead us to imagine." Obviously, his book would have been comparatively unrewarding if he had confined himself to such easy game as Burns, Byron, Rousseau, D'Annunzio, Heine, De Musset, Whitman, Verlaine, and the rest of the passional declaratives. Mr. Mordell deals with this familiar type, as a matter of course, but his principal quarry lies in other fields. Packing his complete set of Freud in a not too cumbersome grip, stuffing in his pocket a capacious note-book already crammed with voluminous observations on the Technique of Psychoanalysis, the Compulsion Neurosis, the Œdipus Complex as an Explanation of Hamlet's Mystery, the Nature and Mechanism of the Obsessional Neurosis, Unconscious Consolatory Mechanisms, the Reaction Impulse and Infantile Regression, etc., etc., and emitting the glad cry of the pursuing Freudian following a scent, he sets forth hot-foot after such unsuspecting victims as Dickens and Wordsworth, Cowper and Keats, Tennyson, Longfellow, Charles Lamb.

The chase is delectable indeed. Let us see, for example, how Mr. Mordell goes after the author of that earliest of Prohibition lyrics, *Drink to Me Only with Thine Eyes.* " The repression of the libido," preambles Mr. Mordell, " includes the damming and clogging up of all the emotional concomitants that go with sexual attraction and make up the feeling called love. Whenever, then, sex or libido is referred to in psychoanalysis the word has the widest meaning. The man who loves a woman with the greatest affection and passion, without gratifying these, suffers a repression of the libido, as well as the man who satisfies certain proclivities without feeling any tenderness or love for the woman. In the attraction for the other sex called love, in which admiration, respect, self-sacrifice, tenderness and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other finer feelings play a great part, there is consciously or unconsciously, however, the physical attraction. If this is totally absent the emotion cannot be called 'love.' What differentiates our feelings towards one of the opposite sex from those felt for one of the same sex (assuming there are no homosexual leanings) is the presence of this sexual interest. Love, then, must satisfy a man physically as well as psychically. It is a concentration of the libido upon a person of the opposite sex, accompanied by tender feelings. Hence when we read the most chaste love poem, we see what is the underlying motive in the poet's 'unconscious.' He may write with utter devotion to the loved one and express a wish to die for her, and though he says nothing about physical attraction, we all know that it is there in his 'unconscious.' It is taken for granted that a man who writes a real love poem to a girl wants to enjoy her love. And when the poet complains because he is rejected or deceived, or of something interfering with the course of his love, we are aware also that his 'unconscious' is grieved because his union is impeded or entirely precluded. The suffering is greater the more he loves, for his finer instincts, as well as his passion, are prevented from being fulfilled."

True, too true. And now we are ready for Ben Jonson and his disguised temperance propaganda. "Let us take at random," says Mr. Mordell with disarming candor, at the same time creeping up silently behind his victim, "a few innocent poems, and test the theory. There is Ben Jonson's well-known toast, *Drink to Me Only with Thine Eyes.* He tells how he sent Celia a rose wreath, that she breathed on it and sent it back to him.

> Since when, it grows, and smells, I swear,
> Not of itself but thee.

"It is well known in science what a great part odour plays in sexual attraction. In this poem the poet, after having received the returned rose breathed upon by Celia, smells her perfume, which now submerges the natural fragrance of the rose. In other words, the poet's 'unconscious' says that he wishes to possess Celia physically. He is talking symbolically in the poem." That is as pretty a demonstration as one could desire, is it not?

Then again, take Tennyson. Recall the song in *The Miller's Daughter.* The poem begins innocuously:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is the miller's daughter.

But Mr. Mordell is too shrewd a Freudian to be deceived by such Victorian window-dressing. There is more here than meets the eye. The poet says—naïvely enough, discreetly enough, you would think—that he would like to be the jewel in the ear of the miller's daughter in order to touch her cheek, the girdle about her waist—

I'd clasp it round so close and tight—

and the necklace upon her bosom to fall and rise—

I would lie so light, so light.

At this point Mr. Mordell engages his victim, wielding his scalpel with exquisite deftness. "The unconscious sexual feelings here are only too apparent," he says. "The symbols of the earring, girdle and necklace are unmistakable. The poet is saying in a symbolical manner that he would possess the miller's daughter."

And how fares the stainless muse of Longfellow? Surely there is no Obsessional Neurosis in that sweetly decorous breast? Surely a Suppressed Libido would perish of inanition in that placid inner chamber of the poet's soul? Be not deceived. Attend to the remorseless probing of Mr. Mordell: "One may see the sex motive in poems where it does not seem to appear. If certain facts in an author's life are known, we may discern the unconscious love sentiments in poems where no mention seems to be made of them. Let me illustrate with a fine poem by Longfellow, the familiar *The Bridge*. Take the lines:

How often, oh how often,
I had wished that the ebbing tide
Would bear me away in its bosom
O'er the ocean wild and wide!

For my heart was hot and restless,
And my life was full of care,
And the burden laid upon me
Seemed greater than I could bear.

But now it has fallen from me, etc.

"To the student of Longfellow, this poem speaks of the time he found it difficult to win the love of his second wife. . . . He married her July 13, 1843. He finished the poem Oc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tober 9, 1845. At the end of this year he wrote in his diary that now he had love fulfilled and his soul was enriched with affection. He is therefore thinking of the time when he had no love and longed for it, and now that he has it, he is thinking of the love troubles of others. In the olden days he wanted to be carried away by the river Charles, for his long courtship, seemingly hopeless, made his heart hot and restless and his life full of care. So we see that in this poem the poet was thinking of something definite, relating to love (and hence also sex); though there is no mention of either in the poem."

Sometimes, however, Mr. Mordell is too rashly assumptive. If we are Freudians, he says, we will conclude that Herbert Spencer does not tell us the whole truth when in his *Autobiography* he ascribes his nervous breakdown to hard work. "We know that most cases of breakdown have had a previous history, usually in some love or sex repression. We are aware that Spencer was a bachelor who never had his craving for love satisfied, and probably led a celibate life. This led to his nervous troubles. This is merely one instance where by the aid of psychoanalysis we can read more than the author reveals."

Well, *we* are Freudians, too, and we dissent. Would not Freud, a lover of scientific precision, read with a blush such loose and slipshod assertion on the part of a professed disciple? Spencer "probably" led a celibate life, and "This led to his nervous troubles"! Mr. Mordell should know that such blandly irresponsible writing discredits genuine scientific investigation.

And does not Mr. Mordell follow Max Graf too uncritically when he says that "psychoanalysis will show us . . . why Wagner dealt with themes like the woman between two men"? Bless your subtle heart, Mr. Mordell! Is that theme peculiar to Wagner? Is it not, probably, the commonest of all dramatic situations? Further, does he intend us to understand that psychoanalysis reveals Shelley's social and political radicalism as having resulted from his disappointment in love? "He hated intolerance, religion and monarchy," says Mr. Mordell, "because by his heterodoxy and the offence it gave to Harriet Grove's parents, he lost her." In the eleventh canto of *The Revolt of Islam,* Mr. Mordell points out, Shelley "describes the agonies of his lost love, with Harriet Grove in mind, no doubt. This

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poem was written in the summer of 1817. Shelley then became an uncompromising reformer; he had suffered in love, on account of the hostility and sorrow he met because of his radical ideas, *hence he would make it his aim to spread the views which he held so that in the future other lovers should not lose their sweethearts because of liberal notions.*" We think that this is unduly naïve.

The trouble with such bald and ingenuous applications of the Freudian technique as Mr. Mordell too often perpetrates is that they are discouraging to those who are trying to promote a more intelligent public attitude toward the problems of what William James called "an entirely unsuspected peculiarity in the constitution of human nature." Mr. Mordell deserves well of all students of psychoanalytic experiment by reason of his honesty, his inexhaustible curiosity, his gusto, his complete conviction. He has produced an unexampled book, challenging and provocative. But we wish he had spent another ten years on it. And we wish he had omitted such uneasily deprecatory sentences as the last of these: "It is therefore true to say that in the tenderest and sweetest love lyrics, like those of Burns and Shelley for instance, one sees the play of unconscious sexual forces. *This fact does not make the poem any the less moral or the poet any the less pure.*" Is Mr. Mordell afflicted with the Presbyterian Complex?

LAWRENCE GILMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED

THE BRITISH NAVY IN BATTLE. By Arthur H. Pollen. Garden City: Doubleday, Page & Company.

That public opinion should be for the most part ill-instructed, if not quite uninstructed, about naval matters, is a condition more regrettable than surprising. What could have been more natural than for people to think, as they did think, before the war, that "battleships are everything"? And why should not one take it for granted to-day that submarines and destroyers are everything? Did not the British Admiralty attribute the escape of Von Hipper at the Dogger Bank to the unexpected presence of enemy submarines? And did not Scheer at Jutland succeed in preventing by a torpedo attack the close action he dreaded? If battleships are too precious to be risked against such tactics, the conclusion seems obvious.

It would make little difference, of course, whether the layman's reasoning on such points were right or wrong if all questions of naval policy were invariably decided by a well-organized and perfectly qualified body of experts. This desirable state of affairs did not begin to exist in England, however, until early in 1918. Meanwhile, blunders were committed, of which the attempt to force the Dardanelles was only one. Apart from that terrible mistake, there were two main causes hampering the usefulness of the British Navy. In the first place, naval authorities said, and the public believed, that an "invincible" navy was as good as a "victorious" navy. In the second place, there was no Higher Command to work out accurate answers to all those technical problems which must continually arise in naval operations, and which no one man is competent to solve.

These two ideas come out as clear as daylight in Arthur Pollen's surprisingly frank, minutely searching criticism, not of the British Navy, but of British naval policy. For that is what Mr. Pollen's book, *The British Navy in Battle*, really is—a far-reaching and accurate criticism, of a sort that few men at any time have had the knowledge and the courage to write. Seldom indeed, when a great crisis has been passed, is one found to point out unsparingly and at the same time without the least suspicion of special pleading, the errors of the winning side. Mr. Pollen, to be sure, seems sometimes to be aiming at mere instruction or even at popular interest. But his clear non-technical explanations of such matters as the control of gunfire and the superior accuracy of heavy cannon, his well-reasoned and thrilling narratives of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

action, scarcely obscure for any but the most superficial reader, and certainly are not designed to *camouflage,* his actual purpose. In reality, throughout his whole treatise, Mr. Pollen strikes with the power and precision of a well directed naval bombardment at certain well-fortified *wrong ideas.*

Like all impersonal, vigorous, well-informed thinking, Mr. Pollen's strictures have a lasting value. Take the hard-gained naval experience of Great Britain in the late war, place all the facts on the table, analyze the technical matter as you would a chess-problem, but include the human elements, too, and treat them, if you can, with equal coolness. Then, so far as your insight will allow, let the facts lead you to certain simple (but not obvious) general conclusions. The result ought to be a degree of enlightenment such as many in the pre-war period desired to gain and could not gain.

England's naval experience is set forth by Mr. Pollen in very full detail and in very clear outline. Roughly, this experience may be summed up as follows:

In 1914, before the British ultimatum was despatched, the British fleet was at its war stations, and within a week transport and trade were going on without interruption. On August 28, in the action near Heligoland the Germans ran away from the English ships, thus apparently conceding the "invincibility" of the British Navy. But in September *Goeben* and *Breslau* were allowed to slip out of the Adriatic and to reach Constantinople, where their presence was a large factor in enabling the Germans to control Turkey. The commerce-destroyers, *Emden* and *Karlsrühe,* were at large, as was Von Spee with a formidable fleet. Several British cruisers were sunk by submarines, and as a final insult German battle-cruisers crossed the North Sea and ravaged a small town of the east coast.

These occurrences brought about the first naval crisis. Prince Louis of Battenberg retired, and Lord Fisher became First Sea Lord of the Admiralty. Then for a time there was vigorous action. The destruction of Craddock's fleet by Von Spee off Coronel in November, 1914, was amply avenged by Sturdee at the Falkland Islands in December. Meanwhile, *Emden* had been defeated and captured by *Sydney,* and *Karlsrühe* seemed to be in hiding. Finally the ignominious flight of the Germans in the action off the Dogger Bank, together with the destruction of one German war-vessel, the *Blücher,* was counted as a considerable British victory.

Although Von Tirpitz's threat of an underwater blockade was disquieting, it caused at first little anxiety, and the second crisis in naval affairs did not occur until the spring of 1915, as the result of the disastrous failure at the Dardanelles. Then there was another change of régime, Sir Henry Jackson succeeding Lord Fisher as First Sea Lord. In reality a much more drastic remedy was needed. "The lessons of the first crisis and the second crisis," says Mr. Pollen, "were the same. Things went wrong in October, 1914, for precisely the same reasons that they went wrong in February, March, and April, 1915. The German battle cruisers escaped at Heligoland for exactly the same reasons that the attempt to take the Dardanelles forts by naval artillery was futile. We had prepared for war and gone into war with no clear

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doctrine as to what war meant, because we lacked the organism that could have produced the doctrine in peace time, prepared and trained the navy to a common understanding of it, and supplied it with plans and equipped it with means for their execution."

On May 31, 1916, was fought the indecisive battle of Jutland, in which the Grand Fleet failed to come to close quarters with the enemy because of the risk from torpedoes. Though it was obvious that the way to deal with the submarines was to mine them into their harbors, and that the only obstacle to this operation was the German fleet, the doctrine of the "Invincible Navy" still held sway. It was no immediate dissatisfaction with the results of Jutland, but rather the growth of the submarine peril, that led to the third naval crisis. By July, 1916, the world was losing shipping at the rate of three million tons a year. Although when Admiral Jellicoe went to Whitehall several colleagues accompanied him from the Grand Fleet, the change of direction and of personnel was not adequate to meet the needs of the occasion. Ruthless submarine warfare went on, and it was clear that unless this were checked England and her Allies could hold out only for a limited period.

In the summer of 1917 began a reorganization, which was completed in the following year. The lesson had now been learned, and the results were seen in the growing mastery of the submarine that marked the period from June, 1917, to January, 1918. A Higher Command was built up; the principle of convoy was adopted. In 1918 a mine barrage was stretched across the channel; minefields were placed in the North Sea, from Norway to Scotland, and in the Kattegat. On April 22 and 23 came the well-planned, daring, and effective operations against Zeebruge and Ostend. Something positive and definite had at last been accomplished.

All the actions mentioned in the foregoing summary, as well as some others, are described and analyzed by Mr. Pollen with such skill in narration and such easy mastery of complex detail as make his accounts highly interesting in themselves. But what strikes one most is the discernment which, without once losing its way or once failing to take account of a relevant circumstance, traces the pattern of the general truths that exist in the mass of miscellaneous facts. The destruction of the *Koenigsberg* at Rufigi was accomplished only after the hasty and approximate mastery of technical problems that had never before been properly studied. Again in the battle of Jutland, Sir David Beatty executed a manœuver which, "judged not as a self-contained evolution but as part of a large plan was one of the most brilliant and original in the history of the naval war." The object of this plan, carried out at great risk, was to bring the German fleet into touch with the British fleet in a position favorable to the latter. Yet by the relatively simple expedients of smoke screens and a torpedo attack—employed, it is true, under conditions of light and of weather favorable to their success—the German admiral was able to escape what looked like certain destruction. Since it cannot be supposed that the British commanders did not know their trade, the only inference from the facts would seem to be that a brilliant and probably successful stroke for victory was frustrated by the obsession of a defensive theory.

Thus, in all the acute analysis of intricate problems which makes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up a large part of Mr. Pollen's book, it will be seen that every fact has been made to give up its meaning, and that the meanings of all the facts gather into two general ideas of a sort not unfamiliar in appearance but seldom found, on examination, to be supported by reasoning anything like so rigorous and realistic as that which Mr. Pollen employs. When Mr. Pollen says that a Higher Command is necessary both to determine the root principles of strategy and to solve so far as possible in advance the technical problems that naval warfare involves, he is not simply urging, on general principles, what would seem on *a priori* grounds to be a good thing: he is giving us the logic of England's experience.

It is plain that a navy department may blunder. It is plain that a navy department needs as safeguards, first, an organization of expert knowledge such as will enable it to solve its particular problems adequately and consistently, and, second, such an education of public opinion as will subject the administration of the navy to the wholesome effect of intelligent criticism while preserving it from ill-judged interference. In a democratic country, like England or America, in which naval measures must inevitably be influenced to some extent by the popular judgment, there is danger when the people, disappointed with the results of naval policy, simply cry out against certain leaders and so bring to pass changes of a political rather than an administrative nature; and there is danger, at least as great, when the people are led by specious logic into false security. Surely these things are worth knowing and pondering.

THE ESSENTIALS OF AN ENDURING VICTORY. By André Chéradame. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Although it was completed a little before the cessation of hostilities and so fails to take into account the armistice and the facts immediately connected with that event, M. Chéradame's latest book is important and timely. One can never be sure that the depths of German duplicity have been sounded; one can never be warned too often against the old fatal mistake of underrating the enemy. It is because M. Chéradame was one of the first—if not actually the first—of men outside the Central Empires to take the full measure of the Pan-German scheme, that he has been able all along to perceive the hidden motives and to appreciate the resources of the Germans. The map of Europe, as he has studied it, has furnished the key both to economic and psychological problems—in short to the whole problem of power.

M. Chéradame anticipated what David Jayne Hill has called "Germany's pose for peace," and he was quick to see the dangers that might grow out of an armistice.

It is surprising to learn the extent to which during the war Allied public opinion was misled as to real conditions in Germany. From the rumor that the Kaiser was dying of cancer to the seemingly authoritative statement that the German people had at last learned, despite their rulers, the magnitude of the disaster that had befallen their arms, all was deceit subtly designed to encourage a too hopeful feeling among the people in the Allied countries and thus

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to cause a relaxation of effort. A majority of those despatches concerning German conditions that filtered through from neutral states are seen to have been inspired. On analysis it is clear that all this inspired news, so widely circulated and so eagerly read, fitted in exactly with German schemes, and that none of it failed to produce a certain effect.

During the war we were many times ready to believe that Germany was reduced to the verge of starvation, and that her man-power was nearly exhausted. Both opinions seem to have been quite wrong; for it was neither want of food nor want of men that finally brought Germany to her knees, but the collapse in the Balkans—a collapse that meant the failure of the whole Mittel-Europa system. So true is this that M. Chéradame is able to show by very precise arguments that "if the decisive importance of the Danube front and of political strategy had been understood in 1915, the war might have been ended long since by a decisive victory." Even so able a critic as Colonel Repington was wide of the truth in his estimate of the number of German reserves, and the rest of us, when we rejoiced over the presence in the German army of boys of seventeen, were mistaking for a sign of weakness what was really an indication of strength! But the whole argument concerning German reserves alone failed to take into account a factor that became of immense importance after the suppression of the Russian front. After that event Germany could have drawn men from a population of about 163 millions, including German subjects in Russia (to the number of 2,400,000), Finns and Ukrainians, always strongly pro-German, and many different groups of Moslems. Unless, therefore, the German armies were somewhere (preferably in the Balkans) promptly and decisively defeated, the Central Powers might hold out indefinitely so far as man-power was concerned. Similarly, whatever temporary privations (severe enough, no doubt) the German people had to endure, it was certain that in the long run, the resources of Mittel-Europa would prove abundant. The problem, in short, was not only military but also geographical and political to an extent that the people in the Entente nations could scarcely be expected to realize and that their leaders were slow to grasp. "It is only at the end of the fourth year of the struggle," writes M. Chéradame, "that we are beginning to understand the value of the Czecho-Slovak and Jugo-Slav populations, who with the Poles and Roumanians form a group of nearly sixty millions of anti-Germans inhabiting central Europe. . . . If the Germans were in the Allies' place, is it possible to believe that they would fail for four years to play the trump-card in their hand, represented by seven millions of anti-German populations?"

Just as Germany, during the war, sought to persuade us that she was starving and that her people were ripe for revolt, so now she will make it appear that she is too poor to pay indemnities, and that she has become republican at heart. The fact is, declares M. Chéradame, that Germany is running over with the plunder of the countries she has despoiled, while France has suffered economic losses not easily to be repaired. Easy peace terms, such as Germany now whines for, might leave Germany the victor and France the loser. "Only annuities paid by the Germans for damages inflicted, used to back French national loans, will enable France to save her people from taxes that would soon be fatal. . . . The French believe firmly that a just peace

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will bring restitution, and that is why they have not lost faith in their paper currency, which in spite of its increase retains its full purchasing power." Moreover, past experience should have taught us to distrust not merely the German militarists, but also the German Socialists, many of whom are at bottom Pan-Germanists, and who have the military spirit in the very blood of their race. Into the war the whole German people flung themselves, body and soul; they must bear their responsibility, and, republican or not, they must be both severely dealt with and must continue to be distrusted by the rest of the world.

M. Chéradame's statement of the peace terms that ought to be imposed is clear, definite, and bold. As to territorial rearrangements, the author is in general accord with the ideas expressed by Colonel Roosevelt and by Senator Lodge, but he points out the difficulties, the danger spots, and the opportunities, with a clearness and definiteness possible only to a life-long student of the mid-European situation. As to reparations and indemnities, he voices the just claims of France, which Americans should be the last to question. As to the necessity of completely crushing German militarism M. Chéradame undoubtedly expresses the prevailing American temper of mind. In regard to this, "thorough" is the word! His warnings as to the real nature of German Bolshevism and as to the dangers of a league for peace give answers to questions just now arising in many minds. This book of M. Chéradame's should, therefore, do much to crystalize American sentiment on the points of real importance. The author's eminently practical and concrete way of thinking, coupled with his unmistakable enthusiasm for ideals that are realizable, ought to give his words easy entrance into American minds.

FRANCE FACING GERMANY. Speeches and Articles by Georges Clemenceau. Translated from the French by Ernest Hunter Wright. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company.

In order to understand the spirit of a people, the shortest way, and one of the best ways, is to study the minds of the men who lead that people and the nature of the eloquence that really moves them. And so without undervaluing the many excellent interpretations of French fighting spirit, of French unanimity, and of French loftiness of motive, that have been given to American readers, one may say that no work of more lasting significance as affording insight into the soul of the nation has appeared than the collected speeches and occasional articles of the Premier Georges Clemenceau.

What has impressed foreign observers in France is the *humanity* of the French army and people—a quality that appears to be at the root of their unconquerable resistance. This "humanity"—characteristic of an advanced civilization—seems, in the writings of Clemenceau, to be founded, curiously enough, in a deep disillusionment, which is, however, still more strangely (as it would seem to Americans) coupled with a devoted idealism.

Try to conceive of an American statesman addressing the people, or any considerable body of the people, in words like these:

"The absolute ideal is not given to man; we know that but too

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well. The most ignorant among us has received assurances that what we call *truth* is but an elimination, more or less complete, of errors. In the hours of crisis, modesty is imposed upon our declarations. Do you not admire the way in which every one, at the first sign of the general peril tacitly took for his dominant principle the obligation to subordinate everything to duties so all-important that they pass even beyond the interest of the country, since the future of the race is involved in them?"

Translated into the terse and emotional Anglo-Saxon idiom, this does not seem so strange. It means simply: Truth is relative; but all Frenchmen fought for the truth as God gave them to see the truth, and in this there is absolute grandeur. But such translation does not altogether bridge the gap. The French mind certainly seems to perceive the relativity of things with extraordinary clearness, with a certain sadness, and yet with a singular exaltation.

Any approach to a true disillusion—sign of an advanced development of *humanity*—confers insight. Can any one fail to see in these pages of Clemenceau's that in a Frenchman skepticism, realism, may be consistent with a practical faith that leads to the utmost self-sacrifice—a faith all the purer because skepticism has purged it of material elements. Faith in itself is good—it is perhaps in a sense necessary; but when a man can say to himself, "I do not know; I see no certainties; but I will die for my country," has he not taken a step upward in the scale of being?

The point of view expressed by Clemenceau could lead to no errors because it does not bind men to disregard truths, or impose the labor of being at all times optimistic. It clears the eyes to see material facts and to perceive calmly and ironically those immaterial facts, the thoughts and motives of one's enemies. It is eminently a civilized point of view.

The eloquence dictated by this way of thinking has at once a curious pathos and a strange sternness. "And you," he said to the people early in 1913, "your France, your Paris, your village, your field, your high-road, your little rill, all of that tumult of history from which you emerge, since it is the work of your forefathers, is it then nothing to you, and will you without emotion hand over that soul, from which your soul is sprung, to the fury of a foreigner?" Than this passage nothing could be more concrete, more practical and yet more elevated. The plea is directed not so much to conscience as to the motives that underlie conscience. In order to understand the attitude of France in regard to the peace terms now under discussion it is necessary to grasp this peculiar blending of actual and immaterial values. The soldiers of France, said Clemenceau, as early as December, 1914, "have not exerted more than human virtues in order to serve as a theme for popular speech-making. They have determined to do something that counts. They are inspired by the idea that aroused their ancestors—the creation of a new Europe for the better uses of humanity, and a higher life. They will accept no German peace and leave behind them conditions pregnant with disaster. A French peace, a peace that will establish a lasting destiny for Europe by reducing to impotence the leaders of savagery, that is the peace desired by our soldiers."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

ITALY'S GREAT SERVICE

SIR.—Allow me, as an old contributor, to express the grief and surprise by which I am overcome as I read your editorial, "The Old Year and the New," in the January NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, which has only reached me this morning. By an incomprehensible oversight (I am almost sure that it is *not* by any deliberate ill will) you ignore Italy as if it did not exist, and as if, in these four years of war, we had not cheerfully sacrificed 500,000 of our best and noblest children, killed outright, twelve billion dollars out of the twenty which form our meagre national capital, and suffered famine and privations such as no other nation has had to sustain. We Italians, the descendants of a civilization two thousand years old, are naturally aware of the melancholy fact that gratitude is notoriously even rarer among nations than it is among individuals, and therefore demand only justice, nothing more, but nothing less. This justice you have denied us in your last Editorial.

Imagine for sake of argument that on that fatal August, 1914, Italy's attitude had been different, that the Italian Government, as Signor Salandra once more pointed out yesterday to the *Matin,* had not assured France that her southeastern frontier was absolutely safe, imagine that Italy had not fearlessly and disinterestedly proclaimed neutrality, no "Miracle of the Marne" could ever have been achieved, Paris would have been taken, France totally submerged under the Hunnish flood, and Great Britain, notwithstanding the Great Fleet, invaded and conquered. The war would thus have ended long before the United States dreamed of intervention, and then you would have had to face alone the overpowering might of a victorious and truculent Teutonic autocracy. Later, on May 25, 1915, when Italy entered the war, the fortunes of the Allies were at their lowest ebb, and by her attack, Italy saved Russia and prevented the whole of the Teutonic forces from falling upon the British and the French armies, then in the most critical of conditions. Italy, whom you ignore, had saved the world for a second time, at a moment when America took only a very languid interest in "the European squabble." And finally, on November 11, 1918, "the Day of Days in the World's modern History . . . Germany surrended," only because Italy, whom you ignore, had on October 27-28, 1918, utterly routed and broken all the Austrian army at the great battle of Vittorio Veneto, and by opening the road to Germany's undefended southern frontier, had convinced the Teutons of their irreparable defeat.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I repeat it once more: we Italians demand justice and nothing but justice, and it would be well that our friends in America, in Great Britain and especially in France, should not attempt to belittle or still less forget the paramount importance of Italy's generous actions and the value of Italy's selfless sacrifices.

Rome. LITTA VISCONTI ARESE.

[The Duke Litta-Visconti-Arese needs, as he himself gracefully intimates, no assurance that our omission of special mention of Italy in the article named was not due to ill will, which, we beg to say, it would be impossible for us to feel for his gallant nation and our chivalrous Ally. To that fact the pages of this REVIEW bear eloquent witness. To go back no further than July of last year, we then published an article relating largely to Italy, "Delenda est Austria," from the accomplished pen of our present correspondent himself. In August, "The Bersaglieri of the Sea," by Captain Vannutelli; in October, "To a Friend in Rome," by Anne C. E. Allinson; and in December, "Venice at War," by Gertrude Slaughter. In addition we have frequently expressed editorial appreciation of Italy's participation in the war and the keenest sympathy with her efforts, now happily attaining success, for the redemption of Italia Irredenta. If the exigencies of space forbade special mention of Italy, and of other worthy themes, in "The Old Year and the New," we may at least gladly testify that the record of Italy's achievements in the Old Year is secure, and that the promise of her reaping their full fruition in the New Year is assured.—EDITOR.]

THOUGHTS ON SOCIALISTIC ROTTENNESS

SIR,—You saw in the platform of the British Labor Party, among other things, "Free entrance of foodstuffs;" in the Peace Proposals of American Labor, "No export of goods not made in factories;" and lastly in the Wilson Peace Proposals, A Representative of Labor on the International Board. But you did not see anything about a Farmer's Representative, because it isn't there. And if it had not been for Mr. Hoover, there would not have been any show for "the men that raised the food to win the war" in the general scramble for everybody else's dollar now going on.

Labor, loud-mouthed, domineering, threatening, and irresponsible, does not contain the majority of American citizens; but it is well on the way to, and then—the Deluge. Once we had a fair working majority of agriculturists; now we have lost it, and with it the conservative balance of power. Let labor begin dictating the future of farmers, and there will not be any farmers. How is England going to revivify her agriculture if the price of everything she raises is controlled by Argentina, but every article of manufacture is raised to the nth price by arbitrary labor exactions? We can see the situation very well, looking across the Atlantic. It is precisely the same here. Labor may be down-trodden, but it is quite attractive enough to empty the farms adjacent to the great industries. The Indians tilled more of Rhode Island than Americans do. They tilled more of Connecticut and Massachusetts. Stop the importation of foreign agriculturists, and see where the milk and butter and eggs will come from. Can any sane man

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

think that the two thousand hands in a brass mill are as valuable to the state as they would be on the farms they have deserted? And is it conceivable that men will choose a fourteen-hour farm day and bare subsistence in preference to a forty-four hour week, pensions, profit-sharing, and inflated wages? I trow not. They won't and they don't.

When Adam Smith wrote in *The Wealth of Nations* that two antagonistic interests were at work in every community: manufactures and agriculture, and that in practice one was always built up at the expense of the other, he foretold what is the matter with England and America to-day. Unless we call a halt, and begin to rebuild our conservative rural classes, the world will not have to be safe for Democracy: there will be no Democracy. It is to the interest of the consuming class to depress the cost of food and with it the condition of the agriculturist to the lowest possible limit. Observe the New York milk strike. As serfdom has not yet come in, the too much depressed class melts away. It does not make much difference to the farmer's wife in Kansas whether there is a mob of anarchists at work in the Paterson silk-mills—she does not wear silk; but it matters a good deal to the inhabitants of Paterson whether the price of flour goes up or down.

The abolition of home industries in farming communities and the transferrance of them to factories is one prime cause of the gradual but certain destruction of agriculture as an attractive means of livelihood. When all the women and half the sons of the farm home are forced into the city to earn their living, the fate of that farm home is sealed. The forty-four hour day for them all.

Moral: If Wilson forces through that labor representative, there must be someone added to look out for the food people.

The advance of Socialism has been steady. At the top of society it has fascinated people with a benevolent turn. To them it combined two absolutely incompatible ideals: a level affluence for all and a total absence of social law. Twenty years ago well dressed people were saying, "Socialism will never get on till we abolish the fetish of a home"; but they had no idea of abolishing their *own* homes. We dined a Fabian Socialist couple last summer. They are morally the salt of the earth. The husband was attired in a fetching green smock, à la Tolstoi, and, as he stated, in deference to our prejudices, trowsers. His wife beside him, he beamed on us and asserted that "marriage is a mistake." We entertained another type earlier in the season, a more dangerous variety. The husband is a rich, pacifist, clergyman-socialist, whose occupation is tampering with the proletariat. "The Germans in Belgium have been frightfully misrepresented," said the wife. "Everything that happened was the fault of the Belgian women; they went mad over those blond German officers! Anyway, non-resistance is the principle." "Applied to yourself?" "Yes; I would cheerfully offer myself and my children as martyrs in the cause." Down further in the social stratum, I heard a carpenter and his friends talking as they built a dam in a brook. This was just after Wilson's New Freedom had brought business to a standstill. "We will never have better times till we go down to New York and kill a few millionaires," said the carpenter. "Millionaires are to blame for all this. Why, I would as soon shoot a millionaire as a muskrat." Everybody agreed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has been going on a long time. When Robert Louis Stevenson, before he went to Samoa, observed, "Socialism is said to be coming; it is here. When everybody is engaged in sawing off the bough his neighbor is standing on, that's Socialism" (I quote without book). Stevenson sensed it at the inception. But what of Mr. Creel's gleeful reply at a Socialist love-feast: "What will become of our millionaires? When we get through with them, they'll have very little left."

What have we with us in the very air we breathe? This rottenness that is creeping into our daily thought? No nationality! No common honesty! No home! No chastity! All seething in the imaginations of as yet perfectly law-abiding people (except Mr. Creel). Now look at the Congressional investigation of Bolshevism. Nothing appears there except these same vague imaginings put to their logical test. The microbe is here, next comes the black death.

There is one weapon at hand—a weapon most effective among the plain people. Now that women can vote more or less, let us take hold of the conservatism that lies in their habits of thought. It has been the instinct of womankind to build up the home, and around it the state, ever since the first woman tamed the first man. Make no mistake. Equal distribution of wealth may appeal; but equal distribution of women and babies hurried into asylums to die, and no conservation of property—these will not suit at all. Never has such a campaign document come to hand as that testimony. The Republican managers should see to it that a copy gets into every house in the agricultural sections and among the wage-earning class. The old slogan, "defense of the home," will have some force with such a commentary. Let the Republicans make it theirs.

NEW YORK CITY. AN AMERICAN.

THE UNIVERSE AND JOHN BURROUGHS

SIR,—

John Burroughs' article in your January number, "Shall We Accept the Universe?" is rationalistic in method and optimistic in tone, but it does not fully reflect the latest scientific views of the ultimate realities either on the materialistic or psychical side, and it does not fully account for some of the highest motives in human conduct.

Science has no evidence of the existence of one and only one universe, nor is there evidence of the existence of one and only one supreme personality or being. The earth is a unit; the sun and the planets and their satellites are a system; we know also that there are countless other solar systems scattered throughout infinite space. But astronomers have never ascertained that these countless systems constitute one ultimate system rather than a plurality of systems. The same chemical elements appear to compose all the stars, and very likely there are all-pervading laws of force and motion; but these common properties do not make the bodies one, any more than uniform color or habits make the sheep in a drove one sheep, or the birds in a flock one bird. Thus the ultimate physical totality may be an aggregate rather than a universe. Kapteyn and some other noted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

astronomers hold that the visible stellar universe has resulted from the collision of two enormous gas clouds coming from opposite regions of boundless space—a theory which points to a pluralistic ultimate conception.

The truth regarding the psychical realities is largely similar. The individual person in the main is a unit; but the whole human race is not one personality. Many types and traits of character are opposite or mutually exclusive; such as, husband and wife, parent and child, soldier and nurse, artist and machinist; or blondness and swarthiness, seriousness and merriment, contemplation and activity, asceticism and luxuriousness. The sum of individuals and types, therefore, is not one personality, but an aggregate of individuals or races. Furthermore, since human life has its source and inspiration in still higher psychical realities, we must attribute to the latter in infinitely higher forms all the types and traits found in humanity and presumably many not found in humanity. In the final synthesis, then, we shall have, not one male supreme being, as Mr. Burroughs holds, but a society or perhaps hierarchy of beings. There will be the divine Mother, Father, Child, Friend, Architect, Artist, Laborer, Statesman, Soldier, Nurse, Teacher, and many others. This society, needless to say, would resemble the deities of the Greeks and Romans.

More correctly, the true view may be a compromise between the monistic and pluralistic ideas: in some degree the realities are one, but in some degree, on the other hand, the universe is many. A serious difficulty for the rationalists is that we must choose between employing old religious terms in new and misleading senses, and inventing new terms for the new conceptions. The latter is quite difficult, and we have as yet but partially accomplished it.

Mr. Burroughs presents a hopeful view of human evolution and welfare, but he does not clearly show why human beings should devote their lives to such an enduring system. It is easy to see why individuals should labor for the pleasures experienced in their own lives. But why should they labor for future generations? Are they to serve the universe for naught? The answer must be that, just as there are enduring objective physical processes, so also there are enduring subjective psychical processes. The individual life has its final realization, not in the present existence, but in the larger evolutionary processes that reach through the ages. In other words, the individuals in the highest sense live on and themselves share in the higher joys and achievements for which they labor and suffer.

Briefly, in conclusion, I would say that, while Mr. Burroughs' views are in many respects instructive and encouraging, there is need of recognition of other fundamental realities, and need of a statement of the inner motives that actuate humanity in the super-individual labors and achievements of civilization.

CYRUS H. ESHLEMAN.

LUDINGTON, MICH.

A SOLDIER ON WAR AND PEACE

SIR,—

The darkness of war which for four years has covered the face of the earth is clearing away. It rests with us whether the world

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shall be cast back into another night as black as that which is past.

In many countries, men's minds are full of worthy pride for those of their blood who fought bravely, and gained victory with honor or met defeat without disgrace. Frenchmen and Germans, British and Americans have glorious memories which for a thousand years will inspire those who come after them with courage and discipline and devotion. But in each of the nations there are also men whose minds are filled with envy, hatred, malice and all uncharitableness. These and their like, in whatever land they lived, did their unconscious but infernal part in bringing on us all the horrors of this war. These and their like will labor on, ignorant instruments, to bring the horror of another and another on us and on our children.

Must we suffer through their iniquity? War is a tonic, it is true; it reveals the noblest traits of men and of nations—traits buried so deep in the rubbish piled up in the easy times of peace that they were forgotten, or remembered only to be ridiculed. But war is evil, even though not wholly evil. Peace is worth almost—but not quite—any price.

It is a professional soldier that writes these words—one of those who, we have been told by so many advocates of peace, love war for its own sake, and gladly force it upon unwilling peoples. But those whose lives are spent, even in peace, in the daily contemplation of war, have learned to hate it with a living, burning hatred that few other men can ever feel until they see its cruelty before their very eyes.

Let us have none of it, so far as with us lies the power of choice.

But neither let us dream that wars are over for all time. The evil-minded man has helped, indeed, in causing every war. But it is the honest difference of opinion of honest men that makes most wars possible. The moral conviction, the belief in the justice of the cause, were equally sincere in North and South in 1861, in France and Germany in 1914. It is when the strong man armed keepeth his house that his goods are in peace. And it is as true now as in those long past days of which the writer wrote, when he said that armor is a proud burden, and a man stands straight in it. Within this year we have seen thousands of shifty eyes learn to look squarely, thousands of stooping shoulders straighten; and into the souls of thousands have entered two previously unknown things—respect for others and respect for self.

Have we learned our lesson? The next few months will show.

But while war may not altogether be prevented either by just treatment of our neighbors or by discipline of ourselves, it may be made sooner or later inevitable by the fostering of suspicion and hatred.

Then let us cleanse the stains of war from our hearts as well as from our hands, in order that there may be not only peace on earth but also good will among men.

S. M. T.

War Department,
Washington, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PAPER LEAGUES

SIR,—

It is unfortunate that current discussion regarding international relations has focused upon a League of Nations and has lost sight of the following underlying facts which demand recognition:—

1—An elastic and sufficient League of Nations composed of societies which adhere to the basic principles of International Law exists and has existed for generations.

2—International Law, approximating in its broad principles the Law of God, furnishes a better standard upon which nations can govern their relations, than can be provided by commitments of the Peace Conference.

3—The war, fiercely fought out on moral issues, has established the Law of Nations which whining publicists were ready to entomb. It has revealed an unsuspected power in law-abiding states which recognize their international obligations and are swift to act.

4—The surprises of an exigent period have shocked the race into recognition of national wickedness and righteousness, and made it suspicious of elaborate programmes which can be used to mask treacherous designs.

5—The fight against autocracy has discovered new and relentless foes. These are anarchy and socialism. The latter, although endorsed by many amiable persons, is a sworn enemy of freedom.

These facts contain in themselves matter which discredits any plan for a convention-made League which is less flexible than that which already binds nations having regard for righteousness or law in an offensive and defensive alliance. The same facts represent a world impatient of experiment, tolerant of universal laws which the human conscience endorses, and suspicious of mechanical efficiency. It is foolish to offer labored and shackling programmes of German-like ingenuity to states which have vindicated their right to freedom.

Before 1914, free peoples did not realize the danger that lurked in compacts with ambitious Governments. There was much regard for form. Pedantry flourished. Men saw in a glass darkly. Now they are seeing face to face. As a consequence, it will not be strange if nations that have suffered by the ambitious action of renegade states, prefer joining in coalitions for mutual defence or the safeguarding of defined principles (a necessary and desirable course), to elaborating vague plans for the perpetuation of peace. That there is danger in any other course is obvious from the experience of the past. Paper Leagues have always failed, notwithstanding the fact that they have frequently sought ends far more concrete than those that are now advocated.

BOSTON, MASS. DANIEL CHAUNCEY BREWER.

FROM A SOLDIER'S MOTHER

SIR,—I am just in receipt (Feb. 21) of a letter from my son, Sergt. Victor Marks, 41 Labor Co., A. S. C., American P. O. No. 915, American Expeditionary Forces, Nancy, France, under date of Jan. 25th, which reads in part as follows:

"Was certainly disappointed today not to have received a letter

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as I have been expecting one for a long while. The delay certainly worries me as I know that you all write regularly. I hope to God that everything is okeh. Just think of it—almost two months since I have had a letter from home."

This is another striking example of the handling of mail to soldiers abroad, in spite of the fact that General Pershing recently announced through the War Department that all mail was being delivered promptly.

Your kindness in giving this the publicity it deserves will be appreciated.

MRS. H. P. MARKS.

MONROE, LA.

"PLAIN HORSE SENSE"

SIR,—I have just read in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for March David Jayne Hill's "International Law and International Policy." If any reader has not read it yet he should read it at once. It has learning and wisdom, patriotism and statesmanship, and plain horse sense. Why think in the clouds and utter the east wind when it is so easy to take counsel with the ancients? Why drug our souls with sounding phrases when the realities stand bare before our eyes?

H. G. PROUT.

NUTLEY, N. J.

THE NATURE OF THE PUNISHMENT

SIR,—In the November issue of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, in the article "Freedom of the Press," the statement occurs: "*The Christian Science Monitor* was denied circulation for three days as a punishment for its publication of and comment upon the aviation report." Please permit me to state that the restriction cited above related only to foreign circulation as there was no restriction whatsoever to the domestic circulation.

ALBERT F. GILMORE.

NEW YORK CITY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(C) *Braun & Cie*

GENERAL GOURAUD

COMMANDING THE FRENCH FOURTH ARMY

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED